

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

ERADICATION OF SCREW-WORMS IN MEXICO

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING,
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

HEARING BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY UNITED STATES SENATE EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 3325 and H.R. 14888

BILLS TO AMEND THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1947, AS AMENDED,
TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO COOPER-
ATE IN SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN MEXICO

JUNE 23, 1966

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1966

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana, *Chairman*

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia

B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota

ROSS BASS, Tennessee

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico

WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota

DONALD RUSSELL, South Carolina

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Kentucky

J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware

JACK MILLER, Iowa

COTYS M. MOUSER, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND GENERAL LEGISLATION

B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina, *Chairman*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi

ROSS BASS, Tennessee

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota

J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware

CONTENTS

Statement of—

	Page
Anderson, Dr. R. J., Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture-----	13
Davis, William C., executive secretary, Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, Phoenix, Ariz-----	19
Fannin, Hon. Paul J., a U.S. Senator from the State of Arizona-----	7
Graham, Harry L., legislative representative, National Grange-----	12
Hayden, Hon. Carl, a U.S. Senator from the State of Arizona-----	11
Johnson, Reuben L., director of legislative services, National Farmers Union-----	12
Lynn, John C., legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation-----	12
McMillan, C. W., executive vice president, American National Cattlemen's Association, Denver, Colo-----	23
Montoya, Hon. Joseph M., a U.S. Senator from the State of New Mexico-----	3
Tower, Hon. John, a U.S. Senator from the State of Texas-----	23
Yarborough, Hon. Ralph W., a U.S. Senator from the State of Texas--	22

Miscellaneous documents:

S. 3325, 89th Congress-----	1
H.R. 14888, 89th Congress-----	1
Report from Department of Agriculture-----	2
Report from Department of State-----	3

ERADICATION OF SCREW-WORMS IN MEXICO

THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 1966

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
AND GENERAL LEGISLATION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in room 324, Old Senate Office Building, Senator B. Everett Jordan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jordan of North Carolina, Montoya, and Young of North Dakota.

Senator JORDAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

Senator Montoya and Senator Fannin, we are glad to have both of you here.

One of these bills is your bill.

I am happy to see that the Department of Agriculture has come out with a favorable report as well as the State Department, which should make this reasonably easy to handle.

We are going to make both of the bills a part of the record.

(S. 3325 and H.R. 14888 follow:)

[S. 3325, 89th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by striking out in the first sentence "or rinderpest", and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "rinderpest, or screw-worm".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals."

[H.R. 14888, 89th Cong., 2d sess.]

AN ACT To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1 of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by inserting "or screw-worm" after the word "rinderpest."

SECTION 2. The Act of February 28, 1947, is further amended by amending section 3 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals."

Passed the House of Representatives June 6, 1966.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.

Senator JORDAN. We will also put in the record the letter from the Department of Agriculture, and the State Department letter will be here. It is supposed to be on its way and it will follow.

(The reports follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1966.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of May 16, 1966, requesting our views on S. 3325. The bill is entitled, "To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico."

This Department recommends enactment of S. 3325.

Under Public Law 80-8, this Department was authorized to cooperate with Mexico in the highly successful foot-and-mouth disease eradication program. The amendment proposed by S. 3325 would extend this authority to include screw-worm eradication.

Cooperative screw-worm activities were started in the Southwest in February 1962 as a 3-year trial program. The objectives of the program were (1) to eliminate screw-worm flies in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico; and (2) to determine the requirements and the economic feasibility for establishing and maintaining an artificial barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies along the Mexican-United States border. These two objectives have been accomplished.

The Federal Government has been given the responsibility by law and regulation to prevent the introduction of foreign pests into the United States. Therefore, maintenance of the barrier zone is a Federal responsibility.

In fiscal year 1966, a full-scale program was initiated to eradicate screw-worms in Arizona and to extend the screw-worm barrier west to the Pacific Ocean. Under the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, funds were made available to start eradication activities in May 1965. The early start helped to prevent the usual heavy screw-worm migrations from Mexico into the United States, making it possible to eradicate the native screw-worm population from Arizona and California in less than one year. Not a single screw-worm was reported in Arizona between December 15, 1965, and March 23, 1966, even though there are areas where the pest can live all winter.

After eradication was achieved in Arizona and California, the sterile screw-worm fly drop was concentrated further south in the barrier zone to reduce the heavy native screw-worm populations in northern Mexico south of Arizona. This should reduce the number of screw-worms that migrate into Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and other States during the summer of 1966.

At present, the screw-worm program consists of operation of the barrier zone from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean and elimination of any cases of screw-worm which penetrate the barrier. The barrier zone is located along the Mexico-United States border in order to take advantage of existing border control of the movement of livestock. The major portion of the zone is in Mexico, but it also includes the southern portions of each of the States of the United States which border on Mexico. This barrier will have to be operated indefinitely to prevent reestablishment of screw-worms in the United States. As long as the barrier remains in the present location, the Department is faced with a continuing high annual cost of operation. It is essential that we find means of reducing the cost and at the same time continue to provide protection against reestablishment of screw-worms in the United States.

One possibility for a substantial reduction in annual operating costs is movement of the barrier zone south to the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, the narrowest point of Mexico. At that location, the barrier would vary from 140-250 miles in width as compared to the present more than 2,000 mile barrier along the Mexico-United States Border. In order to move the barrier to southern Mexico, screw-worms will have to be eradicated in all areas north of the proposed new site.

An extensive field survey is presently in progress in the Republic of Mexico south of the existing artificial barrier zone to obtain information not presently available relating to (a) areas in Mexico favorable to screw-worm breeding; (b) natural population densities during different seasons of the year; (c) favorable resting areas and dispersal patterns; (d) varying husbandry practices in different areas of Mexico; and (e) economic losses in Mexico and on other factors that would be involved in moving the barrier southward. Mexico is cooperating in this survey.

Preliminary results of the survey indicate that eradication of screw-worms from Mexico may well prove technically feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across the narrowest part of Mexico at less cost than operation at the present location. After completion of the survey, providing that final survey data confirm that movement of the barrier is economically advantageous to the United States, a proposed program—with estimated cost—will be developed for consideration by the two Governments. The proposed amendment to Public Law 80-8 would not commit the Department to expenditure of any funds. It would merely provide standby authority under which the Department could cooperate with Mexico in a joint screw-worm eradication program in the event such a program is found to be feasible and desirable.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 20, 1966.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department welcomes the opportunity to comment on the provisions of S. 3325—a bill to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

The Department supports this legislation which is aimed at reducing the prevalence of screw-worm in both the United States and Mexico.

It is noted that pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, such cooperation shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Montoya, we will be glad to hear from you at this time, sir.

Senator MONTOYA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Senator MONTOYA. I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to appear before you in support of S. 3325, a bill which I introduced in conjunction with other Senators, including Senator Fannin, to allow the United States to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in screw-worm eradication.

The screw-worm has long been a costly menace to the livestock industry in the United States. The screw-worm has finally been completely eradicated from the United States, but a constant vigil must be maintained the whole length of the United States-Mexico border to guard against the reintroduction of the screw-worm fly from Mexico. This means the maintenance of a "barrier zone" of approximately 2,000 miles in length.

To maintain a "barrier zone" of such length is an expensive undertaking. A more efficient and less costly means must be found.

This legislation would provide the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in eradicating the screw-worm from Mexico and to maintain a "barrier zone" at a more narrow point in the Mexican interior. This could result in the

establishment of a "barrier zone" of 150-200 miles in length as opposed to the present "barrier zone" of 2,000 miles in length, along the Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona border. The substantially reduced costs are at once apparent.

I wish, at the outset, to bring to the subcommittee's attention similar action already taken by the House. The House, after hearings and due deliberation, has already approved an identical measure—H.R. 14888. In addition, the Department of Agriculture, in its report to the full committee, has strongly supported this legislation.

From what the staff tells us, the Department of State and the Agriculture Department have submitted reports to the committee approving the legislation.

I would like to describe just briefly how the screw-worm fly causes such great economic losses. The screw-worm fly is about twice the size of a house fly. The female lays its eggs, about 250, on the edges of cuts or wounds of livestock and other warm-blooded animals. Larvae hatching from the eggs looks like tiny screws. They tear away at living flesh and kill untreated animals. Grown larvae drop to the ground and enter the pupal stage in the soil. About 21 days from the egg stage, new flies emerge from the soil to begin the next cycle.

The eradication of screw-worms is a relatively simple operation. It is based on an application of atomic energy. Radioactive cobalt is used to sexually sterilize millions of screw-worm flies. (At present, millions of sexually sterile screw-worm flies are reared weekly in a modern, efficient plant near Mission, Tex.) These sterilized screw-worm flies are then airdropped over the infected areas. Native female flies that have mated with sterile males deposit eggs that do not hatch. The continued release of sterile flies in infected areas eventually eliminates the native screw-worm population.

Using this technique, screw-worm flies were eliminated in the Southeastern States in a 3-year period (1957-59); and in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico beginning in 1962. In May 1965, screw-worm eradication was started in Arizona and California and was highly successful in eradicating the pest in the first year of activities.

The livestock industry losses wrought by the screw-worm in Southwestern States, previous to an eradication program undertaken in 1962, are estimated to have ranged as high as \$100 million annually. The losses were even greater in the Southeastern States before the screw-worm was eradicated from that area in 1957 to 1959.

I have more information for the record Mr. Chairman, and I would like permission to file the complete statement.

Senator JORDAN. You may have it follow your statement in the record, if you would like.

Senator MONTOLA. Yes.

Senator JORDAN. It is so ordered.

(The complete statement of Senator Montoya follows:)

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I wish to thank you for providing me with this opportunity to appear before you in support of S. 3325, a bill which I introduced to allow the United States to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in screwworm eradication in Mexico.

The screwworm has long been a costly menace to the livestock industry in the United States. The screwworm has finally been completely eradicated from the United States, but a constant vigil must be maintained the whole length of the

United States-Mexico border to guard against the reintroduction of the screwworm fly from Mexico. This means the maintenance of a "barrier zone" of approximately 2,000 miles in length.

To maintain a "barrier zone" of such length is an expensive undertaking. A more efficient and less costly means must be found.

This legislation would provide the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in eradicating the screwworm from Mexico and to maintain a "barrier zone" at a more narrow point in the Mexican interior. This could result in the establishment of a "barrier zone" of 150-200 miles in length as opposed to the present "barrier zone" of 2,000 miles in length. The substantially reduced costs are at once apparent.

I wish, at the outset, to bring to the subcommittee's attention similar action already taken by the House. The House, after hearings and due deliberation, has already approved an identical measure—H.R. 14888. In addition, the Department of Agriculture, in its report to the full committee, has strongly supported this legislation.

I would like to describe just briefly how the screwworm fly causes such great economic losses. The screwworm fly is about twice the size of a house fly. The female lays its eggs, about 250, on the edges of cuts or wounds of livestock and other warm-blooded animals. Larvae hatching from the eggs looks like tiny screws. They tear away at living flesh and kill untreated animals. Grown larvae drop to the ground and enter the pupal stage in the soil. About 21 days from the egg stage, new flies emerge from the soil to begin the next cycle.

The eradication of screwworms is a relatively simple operation. It is based on an application of atomic energy. Radioactive cobalt is used to sexually sterilize millions of screwworm flies. (At present, millions of sexually sterile screwworm flies are reared weekly in a modern, efficient plant near Mission, Texas.) These sterilized screwworm flies are then airdropped over the infected areas. Native female flies that have mated with sterile males deposit eggs that do not hatch. The continued release of sterile flies in infected areas eventually eliminates the native screwworm population.

Using this technique, screwworm flies were eliminated in the Southeastern States in a three-year period (1957-59); and in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico beginning in 1962. In May 1965 screwworm eradication was started in Arizona and California and was highly successful in eradicating the pest in the first year of activities.

The livestock industry losses wrought by the screwworm in Southwestern states, previous to an eradication program undertaken in 1962, are estimated to have ranged as high as \$100 million annually. The losses were even greater in the Southeastern States before the screwworm was eradicated from that area in 1957 to 1959.

With the virtual eradication of the screwworm in the United States, the problem is now one of preventing reinfestation along the entire United States-Mexico border. As I previously stated, this is being done by maintaining an artificial barrier zone of sterile screwworm flies along the full length of the United States-Mexico border. This requires continued release of sterile flies over the barrier zone. Maintaining this great line (sterile fly barrier zone) over 2,000 miles along the Mexico border costs the United States approximately \$5.2 million annually.

For maximum effectiveness this barrier zone from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean must be maintained as one operation. The maintenance of any portion of the barrier zone is dependent upon the proper maintenance of adjacent portions in order to protect all states. Maintenance of this barrier is considered to be a Federal responsibility because program operations must be conducted largely within the Republic of Mexico, with the consent of the Mexican Government.

The prospect of continuing high annual cost to maintain livestock in the United States free from screwworms makes it essential to find means of reducing the cost and, at the same time, prevent the reintroduction of screwworm into the United States. An extensive field survey of the situation is being conducted throughout the Republic of Mexico south of the existing artificial barrier zone as far as the Mexico-Guatemala border to determine the problems of eradicating the screwworm in Mexico. Mexico is cooperating in this survey. After completion of this survey a proposed program, with estimated cost, is to be developed for consideration by the two Governments.

Preliminary results of the survey confirm the opinion that eradication of screwworms from Mexico is feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across the most narrow part of Mexico, at the Isthmus of Tehuantepec which is

only approximately 150-200 miles across, at a fraction of the cost of the present 2,000 mile-long location at the United States-Mexico border.

Mexico has indicated its interest in a jointly-financed effort to eradicate the screwworm in Mexico. However, the Secretary of Agriculture does not presently have authority to cooperate with Mexico in screwworm eradication. S. 3325 would provide this authority.

S. 3325 would amend Public Law 8 simply by adding screwworm to the list of pests (foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpests) and would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with Mexico in screwworm eradication just as he has cooperated with Mexico in the highly successful foot-and-mouth disease eradication program.

This legislation would not force the Secretary to enter into a program with Mexico. It would merely arm the Secretary with the authority to enter into discussions with the Government of Mexico and consider a joint program proposal after which discussions would be held with the Congress.

There has already been established an extremely successful precedent for joint United States-Mexico governmental cooperation in combating diseases threatening our livestock. The Act of February 28, 1947, which I seek to amend, was enacted as a result of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico in December 1946. By early 1947, this disease had spread over a large part of Mexico and was an ominous threat to the livestock in the States that border Mexico and eventually to the entire livestock population in the United States. Congress responded to this threat and acted to protect the immunity of the United States livestock.

As a result of Congressional action to meet the threat of foot-and-mouth disease, Public Law 8 was approved on February 28, 1947. This act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest (a virile infection of cattle and swine).

With the authority granted to him by Public Law 8, the Secretary of Agriculture was able to work jointly with the Mexican Government. A joint commission was established almost immediately and by 1952 the eradication campaign was completed. There was a brief flareup in 1953 but it was soon put down. Thus, through the cooperative efforts of the United States and Mexican Governments, foot-and-mouth disease was completely eradicated by December 1954.

United States and Mexican personnel demonstrated that they could work effectively together in the many phases of the eradication campaign. In addition, Mexican troops enforced the quarantines to prevent the disease from being spread further through the movement of infected livestock. New roads and landing strips had to be built to get heavy equipment to inaccessible outposts which included thinly settled mountain regions and tropical forests.

Almost a million infected animals were slaughtered in 1947 before a vaccination control plan was adopted whereby vaccination teams worked in successive waves inward from the borders of the quarantine zone. In succeeding years, ten of thousands more livestock had to be destroyed.

It was a hard and costly battle, but eventually the campaign was successful.

The eradication of foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico marked a milestone in bilateral cooperation in control of animal diseases. Successful conclusion of the campaign meant that foot-and-mouth disease had not gained a permanent foothold in North America.

During the seven years from 1947 to 1954, the United States spent approximately \$134 million, and Mexico spent approximately \$22.5 million in direct contributions in combating foot-and-mouth disease. This latter figure does not include salaries paid by the Mexican Government or the expenses of the use of approximately 25 percent of the Mexican Army during the project.

The costs were great, but if foot-and-mouth disease had been permitted to spread northward to the international border it would have been impossible to keep foot-and-mouth disease out of the rest of the continent, and the costs would have been incalculable.

Just as Congress rose to the threat of foot-and-mouth disease to the livestock of the United States, Congress can and should likewise rise to the occasion and meet the threat presented by the presence of the deadly screwworm just across our border in Mexico.

The successful eradication of foot-and-mouth disease through joint governmental efforts attests to the desirability, to the economic necessity, of likewise jointly

combating the pestilent screwworm. This can be effected by enactment of S. 3325.

I urge this subcommittee to take prompt and favorable action on this bill.
Thank you.

Senator MONTÓYA. In this legislation we are giving authority to the Secretary of Agriculture similar to the hoof and mouth program a few years ago, whereby he entered into agreements with the Mexican Government to provide for joint cooperation by this Government and the Mexican Government to eliminate hoof and mouth disease. Our herds were in constant danger of being infected on this side of the border. We are amending the hoof and mouth disease statute by simply adding "screw-worm" to the provisions—that is the only change.

Now, another thing that bears a little more explanation is the barrier zone. The borders of the States that I have previously mentioned in my statement, comprise about 2,000 miles in length along the Mexican border. Now, in order to completely eradicate any danger to our herds here in this country, we must not only maintain this barrier zone for some reasonable length of time, but the screw-worm must also be eradicated in Mexico down to a narrow point in southern Mexico which would provide a barrier only—150 to 200 miles long. It would be much more economical to maintain this protective barrier zone than the present one. The screw-worm danger would also be moved farther from the border of the United States.

That is what this legislation is designed to accomplish, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into an agreement for a joint program to eradicate the Mexican fly within the plan or blueprint that I have outlined.

Senator JORDAN. There will be no problem with the Mexican Government in working out this treaty, will there?

Senator MONTÓYA. Not at all, because the Mexican Government experienced great success and great cooperation from our Government during the hoof and mouth disease, and I am sure that they would be very willing. In fact, the Mexican Government is presently cooperating in the barrier zone that we now have against the screw-worm fly.

Senator JORDAN. I remember about the hoof and mouth disease, because they were as much interested in that as we, for their own sake, for the cattle they had. And they are the same on this, I imagine.

Thank you very much.

Senator Fannin, we will be glad to hear from you, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON PAUL J. FANNIN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Senator FANNIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Montoya. I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you this morning to support this bill.

Senator JORDAN. Glad to have you.

Senator FANNIN. I want to commend Senator Montoya for a very excellent, comprehensive statement in exploring this problem.

Senator JORDAN. Let me ask you a question. You seem to be an authority on this. How far does this infection reach into the United States proper? To some degree, pretty well over it?

Senator MONTTOYA. No, I will tell you why. The infection can come into the United States and does come in because we are importing some cattle from Mexico. Occasionally, the screw-worm is transported on cattle or with the help of wind the fly will travel quite long distances. It may infect some of our herds here in this country in the warm climates. Now, if the cattle are taken to a cold climate, the screw-worm perishes; no further damage occurs. Therefore the screw-worm cannot survive in cold climates.

Senator JORDAN. I was on a hunting trip near Savannah, Ga., about 5 or 6 years ago—maybe a little longer. One of the men in our party killed a deer—I did, too, but mine did not have this. He said it had a screw-worm in it. It had eaten the whole side of his head off. The ranger there said it was a screw-worm. Is that the way they work on them?

Senator MONTTOYA. Yes; the flies land on open wounds and lay their eggs. Then, when the larvae hatch in a few days, they drop to the ground, and soon emerge as flies. This cycle is repeated many times.

Senator JORDON. I did not know whether it was prevalent down there or not, or just an occasional case like that.

Senator FANNIN. At one time, it was very prevalent throughout the warm areas of the country.

Senator JORDAN. That is right up from Savannah, so it is warm down there.

Senator FANNIN. This legislation represents a logical step forward beyond the highly successful screw-worm eradication program that has been conducted in the United States. As I stated before, I want to express my wholehearted support of the bill.

You will hear from witnesses who can testify from professional knowledge and experience about the screw-worm problem and the wisdom of the type of international control program which this legislation will make possible. I merely want to take a few moments to relate some personal observations growing out of my experience as Governor of Arizona.

I want to relate that during the time that I was working with the Mexican people, they expressed both from the standpoint of the State government, the State of Sonora, and from the standpoint of the Cattle Association of Mexico, their wholehearted support of this program. California and my State of Arizona were the last two States to be declared free of native screw-worm flies.

Our State control authorities, working in harmony with their Federal counterparts and with the livestock industry, have contributed to making this program one of the most successful animal health efforts ever conducted in this country. The State of Arizona appropriated matching funds to be used over a 2-year period for screw-worm eradication, and livestock producers themselves have raised \$350,000 from their industry to get the job done. So this has received the support both of the livestock industry in Arizona as well as State support.

Enough knowledge has been acquired now to know that the few cases being found have been caused by flies transported from Mexico. Thus, it seems to me highly logical that we extend our efforts to our sister Republic so that the benefits will accrue to the livestock of both nations. We will be protecting the investment we have already

made and, at the same time, assisting the Mexican livestock producers to obtain equivalent benefits. I can assure the committee that the representatives of the Mexican Government and the producers will be pleased to cooperate in such a program. Arizona and the State of Sonora in Mexico are now enjoying many expanded benefits from cooperative ventures in other areas of endeavor. I might also point out that the University of Arizona and the University of Sonora are continuing a close research and study program in animal husbandry. Our State's working relationships with the State of Sonora have never been better, and I am assured of their enthusiastic cooperation in a screw-worm program.

I very much appreciate having the privilege of presenting my views on this subject.

If there are any questions, Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Senator JORDAN. First I want to say to Senator Young that I am glad he is here. Senator Montoya has already made his statement. He put a transcript of it in the record.

You know, he is one of the authors of this bill, along with Senator Fannin, Senator Anderson, Senator Hayden, Senator Kuchel, Senator Murphy, Senator Tower, and Senator Yarborough. The Agriculture Department has sent a favorable report; the State Department is sending one which has not arrived yet, but they assure us it is favorable.

The House has passed H.R. 14888.

Senator MONTOKA. Right.

Senator JORDAN. Which is almost an identical bill to Senator Montoya's bill.

Senator Young, do you have any questions to ask either of these gentlemen?

Senator YOUNG. I am sorry I am late getting here. I had an office full of people this morning.

I am particularly interested in this subject, as this has become quite controversial in the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking Republican. We went into this there in some detail last year. Just how would this change the present situation? Will this be a cooperative venture with Mexico which we do not have now?

Senator MONTOKA. Well, the way the present effort is working, Senator Young, the different States along the border of Mexico—namely, California, Arizona, Texas, and New Mexico—through their cattle associations or the State agencies dealing with cattle sanitation and other branches of the State government, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and by a matching fund approach, have been very successful in eliminating the screw-worm from this border. They have created a barrier zone wide enough so that they are able to stop the flight of these flies to points within the United States.

Now this is a 2,000-mile barrier zone that we have right now, and it requires constant vigilance and attention. So long as the screw-worm fly remains in Mexico without eradication, and that is the case today, we are going to have to maintain this barrier zone at a great cost. So what we are trying to do through this bill is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into an international agreement with Mexico, such as was done in the hoof and mouth disease program,

so that by joint cooperation the screw-worm will be eradicated down to a point in the extreme southern part of Mexico—from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific—and there a barrier zone will be created, 150 to 200 miles long. Thus, we will eliminate the costly 2,000-mile barrier.

Senator YOUNG. As I recall, the main discussion last year revolved around whether the State of Texas, and I think some others, should have the sole responsibility of eradication above this buffer zone. Am I correct?

Senator MONTTOYA. When I was on the Appropriations Committee in the House questions were frequently raised as to whether the States or Federal Government should shoulder this responsibility.

Senator YOUNG. Above this buffer zone?

Senator MONTTOYA. That is right, within the exterior boundaries of the States concerned. But we always won that battle in the Appropriations Committee. We always got matching funds.

Senator YOUNG. I know they had a long battle last year. This appropriation was tied up in conference for about 2 months.

What is the estimated cost of this program? I was familiar with the hoof and mouth disease problem.

Off the record.

(There was discussion off the record.)

Senator MONTTOYA. I cannot tell you what the estimated cost will be as it all depends on how much of a burden Mexico agrees to assume.

However, it will not be as costly as the hoof and mouth disease program. This program was very expensive as it was necessary to buy and then slaughter diseased cattle.

Senator YOUNG. The Mexican Government finally refused to go along with that. They had their own vaccination program which they thought would eradicate it. We did not believe it would, but they did finally eradicate it that way.

Senator MONTTOYA. I believe they killed over a million cattle.

Senator FANNIN. This is a proven program and has been extremely successful. It does have the cooperation of the States along the border. As I illustrated, in the State of Arizona, we have a 2-year period for screw-worm eradication in which the livestock producers themselves have raised \$350,000.

Senator YOUNG. Unless you did this, this would be a continuing problem for years to come?

Senator FANNIN. Yes; from the standpoint of our State borders, we must have a program that extends down to Mexico; otherwise, the flies would continue to come in, be transported in, and the States would have this problem. It would naturally infect other States as it infected our State.

Senator JORDAN. How far do these flies fly?

Senator FANNIN. Most of the trouble has been coming from the livestock in Mexico.

Senator JORDAN. It is not a matter that they can fly any distance?

Senator FANNIN. Dr. Anderson said about 180 miles.

Senator JORDAN. That they can travel?

Senator FANNIN. Are most of them brought in on the livestock?

Dr. Anderson says no; most of them migrate.

Senator JORDAN. I guess it depends on whether they get a good tailwind how far they can go. I am sure of that; it makes a lot of difference. They will ride it.

Senator Fannin, do you have anything further?

Senator FANNIN. No, unless there are any questions. I very much appreciate being with you this morning.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Young, do you have any questions?

Senator YOUNG. No; I do not think so. I am quite familiar with it, except for this new proposal for eradication of the fly within Mexico. Offhand, I think it is a good suggestion.

Senator JORDAN. Well, I am certain that—I am told that was the same law as we have on the hoof and mouth disease, but they just added “screw-worm” to the same language, so the treaty can be the same thing.

It makes good sense that if there is a fly right here and we are here, he is going to keep right on infecting us unless we can kill him over there. The States are to be commended for the effort they have put into it, along with the livestock people.

Thank you very much. We appreciate your being with us.

Senator FANNIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. You may stay as long as you like.

Senator FANNIN. Thank you kindly, but I do have another committee meeting.

Senator JORDAN. Dr. Anderson?

Before you start, I want to put in a statement from Senator Hayden in support of this bill; another one from John Lynn, of the Farm Bureau, in support of the bill; one from Reuben Johnson, in support of the bill; and one from Harry Graham.

Off the record.

(There was discussion off the record.)

(The documents referred to follow:)

STATEMENT BY HON. CARL HAYDEN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear today before your Committee to testify on behalf of S. 3325, a bill I have co-sponsored with my Colleagues from States bordering on Mexico, which would amend Public Law 80-8 to permit a cooperative effort between the United States and Mexico to eradicate the screwworm.

Since initiation of the Southwest Screwworm Program in 1962, this disastrous livestock pest has been all but eradicated from those border States between the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean. The last segment of the barrier zone, the border along the States of Arizona and California, was established as late as May, 1965, and, according to the Department of Agriculture, the adult screwworm population in those two States was eradicated in the year that has since passed. This remarkable achievement now presents the Department of Agriculture with the responsibility of full Federal maintenance of the barrier zone to prevent further reinfestations of screwworms from across the Mexican border. As this Committee is aware, the cattle growers in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California contributed to the eradication expenses of areas within the United States, but rightly feel that the Federal Government should exercise its legal responsibility of preventing the introduction of foreign pests into this country.

Recognizing its responsibility, the Department of Agriculture has cooperated with Southwestern cattle groups, including the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, in preparing S. 3325 for consideration by the Congress. It is that Department's opinion that initial studies have shown the feasibility of moving the barrier zone to a point in Mexico that would be much shorter and less expensive to maintain. For example, at the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, the zone would extend for 140-250 miles, compared with over 2010 miles along the U.S.-Mexico border. Additional and more extensive surveys are needed and it will be necessary to bring the Mexican Government into cooperative agreements to accomplish these investigations.

There is no better way to authorize screwworm investigations in Mexico than to amend Public Law 80-8, which originally set up the United States-Mexico cooperative program for control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease that

threatened the cattle industry along both sides of the border some twenty years ago. Therefore, I urge this Committee to give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 3325 so that the Department of Agriculture can begin necessary negotiations with Mexico—not later than the end of this calendar year.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 22, 1966.

Hon. EVERETT B. JORDAN,
Chairman, Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JORDAN: On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation we would like to express our support for S. 3325. This bill amends the legislation of 1947 to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to cooperate in the screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

The work of farmers and ranchers and the federal government in the screw-worm eradication program has been outstanding. We are all greatly pleased over the announcement that the United States has been declared free of this livestock pest.

S. 3325 will make it possible for the U.S. Government to continue a cooperative program with Mexico in order to insure that the United States will remain free of screwworms.

We hope that this legislation can be enacted at an early date.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
*Legislative Director,
American Farm Bureau Federation.*

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 16, 1966.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
*Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Farmers Union is in support of S. 3325 to provide for cooperation with Mexico in eradicating the screw-worm fly.

This bill, as we understand it, would make it possible to establish a buffer zone South of the border and would benefit both Mexico and the United States. With the technical knowledge we now have, it is entirely possible that the screw-worm could be eradicated from the entire North American continent.

I respectfully request that you make this memorandum a part of the hearings on S. 3325.

Sincerely,

REUBEN L. JOHNSON,
*Director of Legislative Service,
National Farmers Union.*

STATEMENT OF HARRY L. GRAHAM, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL GRANGE

The National Grange has supported the objectives of S. 3325 for the last few years and urges the Congress to give this bill your prompt attention.

At our 1964 Annual Session, the Delegate Body of the National Grange adopted this resolution on screwworm eradication:

"Whereas, the Southwest Screwworm Eradication Program during the past two years has proved fully effective, and

"Whereas, the program must continue to treat a buffer zone several hundred miles wide in Mexico to help prevent reinfestation, and

"Whereas, costs thus far have included over \$3.2 million raised by livestockmen and sportsmen and another \$2.7 million provided by the State of Texas; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the National Grange take the stand that this program is in the public interest and under no circumstances should it be allowed to lapse; and, be it further

"Resolved, That since this program is now international in scope to the extent that a joint international program is indicated with the United States and Mexican

Federal Government obligated to furnish additional financial support to this program, that the National Grange urge support of such a program."

We feel this proposed legislation is important to all cattle producers throughout the United States. A present survey conducted by the Republic of Mexico indicates that the eradication of screwworms is feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across the narrow part of Mexico at a fraction of the costs of the present program.

At present, the U.S. Department of Agriculture does not have authority to work with the Mexican Government in screwworm eradication, although it does have authority to work with them in foot-and-mouth eradication programs. The eradication of the screwworm must obviously be a joint effort as well, and we therefore hope that the Congress will give its prompt approval to this bill allowing the USDA to consider a joint program proposal with the Mexican Government.

Senator JORDON. Doctor, we are glad to have you with us, sir. We shall be glad to hear from you as you wish.

**STATEMENT OF DR. R. J. ANDERSON, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE**

Dr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to express the views of the Department of Agriculture on S. 3325, now under consideration by this committee. The bill would amend Public Law 80-8 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

The Department favors enactment of S. 3325.

Public Law 80-8 was passed in 1947 to enable this Department to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in that country in order to protect the agricultural economy of the United States. Our livestock industry was threatened with extreme losses and disruption should foot-and-mouth disease have become established in this country. The program resulting from this legislation brought about the eradication of the disease in Mexico and removed this threat to the United States.

Enactment of S. 3325 would authorize the Secretary to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in the eradication of screw-worms if that should be found to be feasible and economically advantageous to the United States. In fiscal year 1958, a cooperative eradication program was undertaken with Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. This program was completed during the fiscal year 1960 with great economic benefits to that region of the Nation.

Following the success of the program, it was necessary to protect these States from reinfestation. A line of inspection stations was therefore established along the Mississippi River to prevent the movement of screw-worm-infested animals to the Southeastern States.

At that time, livestock producers in the Southwestern States were suffering losses from screw-worms estimated at from \$25 million to \$100 million annually. Cooperative screw-worm eradication activities were started in the Southwest in February 1962. The objectives of the program were—

- (1) To eliminate screw-worms in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and Mexico; and

(2) To determine the requirements for and the economic feasibility of establishing and maintaining a barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies along the Mexico-United States border.

These objectives have been accomplished.

In fiscal year 1966, a full-scale program was initiated to eradicate screw-worms in Arizona and to extend the screw-worm barrier west to the Pacific Ocean. Native screw-worms have been eradicated from Arizona and California, and the barrier zone now extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean along the Mexico-United States border.

Senator YOUNG. Do you mind an interruption there?

Dr. ANDERSON. No.

Senator YOUNG. How far north does the barrier zone extend?

Dr. ANDERSON. The barrier varies in width. About 20 percent of it is on the United States side of the border, and about 80 percent is on the Mexican side of the border. It varies in width up to 300 miles, depending upon the concentration and the incidence of the screw-worm in Mexico which poses a threat to the United States. There are certain areas along the border where it is high and dry and the climatic condition is not too suitable to the propagation of screw-worm flies. There are seasons of the year in which they do not drop any flies. But the barrier, as such, extends all the way across the border. It does come up into the United States, varying from 50 to 125 miles.

Senator YOUNG. It does not extend as far over as Florida, though?

Dr. ANDERSON. The screw-worm, prior to 1960, infested Florida and all of the Southern States. It was capable of overwintering in Florida, overwintering in the southern parts of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. With the coming of warm weather in the spring, it would build up tremendous populations and migrate northward, and there have been times back in, I think, the late forty's where they moved as far as South Dakota, causing severe losses in that region, because people were not accustomed to them and did not know exactly how to handle them. But they would move with livestock and migrate up through the central part of the United States in the warm weather.

Senator YOUNG. They had no trouble in Florida since 1960?

Dr. ANDERSON. The screw-worm eradication program in Florida was completed during 1960. There were a few migrations from the Southwest over into that region prior to the initiation of the program in the Southwest. Since the screw-worm has been eradicated in the Southwest, there have been no recurrences in the Southeast.

Senator YOUNG. Do you think the eradication in the Southwest has a direct effect on preventing any future problem in the Southeast?

Dr. ANDERSON. Definitely so. Without the program in the Southwest, they would have been subjected to intermittent reinfestations of the Southeast, with the risk of the screw-worm becoming permanently established and overwintering in Florida.

Senator YOUNG. Do you still use the same method invented by Dr. Bushland?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, we do; with the rearing of the screw-worm and subjecting the pupae to the radiation of cobalt 60, then the release of the adult fly over the area involved.

Senator YOUNG. Dr. Bushland is now head of a new metabolism research laboratory at Fargo, N. Dak.

Senator JORDAN. Are they not working on that same method to kill the boll weevil?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; they are attempting to apply the same technique to many pests that affect agriculture in this country. It is being used presently on the Mexican fruit fly along the California and Mexican border. They are carrying out research on the use of the sterility principle on the boll weevil and many of the others, including the tsetse fly in Africa. It is being investigated over there as a means for the control and eradication of that pest.

Senator YOUNG. Dr. Bushland is raising quite a few boll weevils up there in North Dakota, experimenting with them.

Senator JORDAN. I hope he keeps them up there. We do not need them.

Well, that is a very interesting development. It can save the farmers hundreds of millions of dollars in all sorts of crops. It is a great breakthrough in that particular field of research. I am glad to support any kind of legislation that will keep eradicating these diseases that are a plague to farmers and to industry. Some people think that if a farmer loses a cow, he is the only one who loses, but everybody loses. If the fellow does not have something to sell, he does not buy anything, and it goes on down the line.

It is a very interesting thing, and this has been done numerous times, to take a dollar and let a fellow spend it and trace that dollar and find out how far it goes, what it buys. Economics do not stop or start at the same place. They just keep on going.

You may proceed, sir. I am sorry to have interrupted you.

Dr. ANDERSON. The Federal Government has been given the responsibility by law to prevent the introduction of foreign pests into the United States. The Department believes that in order to meet this responsibility in the case of screw-worms, an effective barrier zone must be maintained between Mexico and the United States to prevent the reintroduction of this serious economic pest.

The major portion of the barrier zone is on the Mexican side of the border where we are conducting the program with the permission of the Mexican Government. The zone also includes the southern portions of each of our States which border on Mexico.

The screw-worm is endemic in Mexico. Therefore, to prevent reinfestation, a barrier will have to be maintained indefinitely. As long as the barrier remains in its present location, the Department is faced with a continuing high annual cost of operation. We are hopeful of finding means of reducing costs and at the same time to continue to provide protection against the reestablishment of screw-worms in this country.

One possibility for a substantial reduction in annual operating costs is movement of the barrier zone south to the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, the narrowest point of Mexico. At that location, the barrier would vary from 140 to 250 miles in length as compared with the present more than 2,000-mile barrier along the Mexico-United States border. In order to move the barrier to southern Mexico, screw-worms would have to be eradicated in all areas north of the proposed new location. This would materially reduce annual maintenance costs and also relieve the pressure of reinfestation with which we are constantly faced with the barrier in its present location.

An extensive field survey is presently in progress in the Republic of Mexico south of the existing artificial barrier zone to obtain infor-

mation not presently available relating to (a) areas in Mexico favorable to screw-worm breeding; (b) natural population densities during different seasons of the year; (c) favorable resting areas and dispersal patterns; (d) varying husbandry practices in different areas of Mexico; and (e) economic losses in Mexico, and to other factors that would be involved in moving the barrier southward. Mexico is cooperating in this survey.

Passage of the proposed amendment to Public Law 80-8 would not commit the Department to undertake a cooperative screw-worm program in Mexico or to expend any funds for that purpose. The Department up to this time has not made any plans to conduct a cooperative program in Mexico, but it desires to have standby authority under which it could work with Mexico and other public and private organizations and individuals in a joint screw-worm eradication program in the event such a program is found to be feasible, desirable, and economically sound.

I will be pleased to respond to any questions which the chairman or other members of the committee may have.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you, Dr. Anderson. That is a very interesting report.

I was wondering, when you said a while ago that you are already going over within the boundaries of Mexico, why you needed a treaty, but I can understand why you do. You are working with them now, however, with permission? I am sure they are glad to have you in there to help them on this thing.

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. There was some question as to whether the Department would have authority to cooperate with Mexico in an all-out eradication program. Our present work is being conducted under the 1903 Animal Quarantine Act, 32 Stat. 792, section 2, which authorizes the Secretary to carry out inspections and to issue regulations as he deems necessary to prevent the introduction of foreign diseases and pests into this country. We think that this action is necessary along the border to prevent the reintroduction, and therefore we would have the authority to do what we are doing. But we need to clarify the authority and be sure that we are following the intent of Congress if we should cooperate with Mexico, and therefore we think this proposed legislation would certainly clarify the air in that respect.

Senator YOUNG. Would you use CCC funds?

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir. If a program should be developed with the mutual agreement of the Mexican Government, and the financial arrangements for sharing the cost of the program are all worked out, then the Department would come forward to the Congress and ask for appropriated funds to carry out a joint program.

Senator YOUNG. These would be direct appropriations?

Dr. ANDERSON. Direct appropriations.

Senator YOUNG. The foot-and-mouth disease was paid for out of CCC and then they were reimbursed.

Dr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Senator YOUNG. You do not have any limit on authority to spend the funds in this authorization?

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir, but—

Senator YOUNG. Of course, that could be limited by the Appropriations Committee.

Dr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes, the Appropriations Committee would certainly have the say-so on how much would be made available for that purpose.

Senator YOUNG. Is there any limit on the amount that can be spent for eliminating foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico?

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir; I believe that the authority that the Secretary had was that he was authorized, and this, I think, is part of the annual appropriations language, he is authorized to expend funds available to the Department to combat outbreaks of foreign diseases to the extent necessary. This may include funds from the Community Credit Corporation. I think that has no binding effect—

Senator YOUNG. I would think it would be easier to get approval for this than it would for the broader authority under CCC, because the Appropriations Committee would have a more direct control over the amount of money that was spent and how you do it.

Dr. ANDERSON. The CCC authority would not be extended to cover screw-worms. It is specifically identified as to foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases which threatens the livestock and poultry industries of the United States.

Senator YOUNG. Have you any estimate as to the yearly cost of operating the additional program in Mexico?

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir, we do not. That is one of the objectives of the present survey now underway, to determine if it is feasible, and if so, what type of program it would entail, and an estimate of the cost of the program.

Senator YOUNG. We already have a program. It would just be a matter of an additional program?

Dr. ANDERSON. It would be a matter of the additional program necessary to carry the eradication on further south.

Senator YOUNG. That is all I have.

Senator JORDAN. Doctor, in a program such as this, could you still let the Cattlemen's Association contribute matching funds if they so desired?

Dr. ANDERSON. This proposed legislation provides the Secretary with authority to cooperate not only with Mexico but with other organizations and individuals, so we could.

Senator JORDAN. States are doing it now and associations and individuals?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Doctor.

Senator YOUNG. I have just one more question.

Would embarking upon this program mean there may be a tendency for the cattlemen to withdraw their financial support of the program?

Dr. ANDERSON. This present Appropriations language that we are operating under in the Southwest did not specify, for example, in Texas and New Mexico, that the eradication activities had to be matched by the cooperator. It did prior to the eradication in Texas and New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Louisiana. It was binding in Arizona and California this fiscal year. The present language that is contained in the House bill did not provide for matching as it did this year.

Senator YOUNG. Are the border States contributing now?

Dr. ANDERSON. They are contributing this year. For the total program in the Southwest up to 1966, the total expenditure was about

\$17 million, \$14 million of which constituted cooperative activities, and New Mexico and Texas and the other States, and the livestock people, contributed almost \$7 million of the \$14 million for cooperative activity.

This fiscal year, the program cost is running around \$5.2 million for the entire operation, with the cooperators contributing, I think, \$1,200,000 and the Federal, exclusive of the cost of the survey in Mexico, which is \$325,000, \$3,800,000.

Senator YOUNG. Well, I think some local participation is good for the program. For example, I think cattlemen would be more cooperative in reporting immediately any infestation that they might find if they were responsible for part of the cost of it. I think the States would take much the same position. I do not think they should be burdened with a heavier program. I think there is some Federal responsibility here, but I would not want to discourage local participation.

Dr. ANDERSON. No, this program, if it should come about in Mexico under this authority, we would expect a cost-sharing arrangement with the Mexican Government, and they, in turn, have assurance from the livestock people that they would contribute toward the cost of the program.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. You heard what I said a while ago about that deal down in Georgia. I have been thinking, that was about 10 years ago. There was some in Alabama—it was right along the coast.

Dr. ANDERSON. The screw-worm fly prior to the eradication program in the Southeast would overwinter in an area from Gainesville, across the peninsula of Florida, down to the keys. With the coming of warm weather, they would infest Georgia, Alabama, parts of Mississippi, come up into South Carolina, and even up into North Carolina, causing tremendous losses in livestock, which was estimated to be up to \$20 million a year.

Senator JORDAN. Does that get in rabbits, too?

Dr. ANDERSON. It gets in all warmblooded animals.

Senator JORDAN. Chickens, too?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes; in chickens and even in humans. There have been reported cases in a human where the screw-worm fly deposited eggs on scratches and wounds resulting in larval infestation.

Senator JORDAN. Could it kill them, too?

Dr. ANDERSON. I do not know of any deaths of humans. Infested animals, if unattended, may die within 10 days.

Senator JORDAN. Really?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes. Screw-worms cause not only destruction of the flesh, but a toxemia that causes the animal's death.

Senator JORDAN. I did not realize that. I thought it was a rather slow death, through destruction of the tissue.

Dr. ANDERSON. Where you have a heavy infestation, they continue to lay eggs on the edge of the wound, and it results in more screw-worm larvae feeding on the animal. That causes quite a toxic condition.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony. In fact, I have enjoyed it.

Dr. ANDERSON. Thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Now we have Mr. William C. Davis, from the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association.

Mr. Davis, we are glad to have you with us and we shall be pleased to hear from you.

Do you have a prepared statement?

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. DAVIS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
ARIZONA CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, PHOENIX, ARIZ.**

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator JORDAN. You may proceed as you wish, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. My name is Bill Davis. I am executive secretary of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association. I am here today in a dual capacity; in addition to representing the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, I am also speaking on behalf of the South West Animal Health Research Foundation which is the private group that has led the screw-worm eradication program in the Southwestern United States.

I would like to briefly bring the committee up to date on the program and then explain why we feel the passage of S. 3325 is so important to us.

After the successful eradication in 1960, of the screw-worm from Florida and other Southeastern States, livestock producers in States along the Mexican border decided to try to accomplish eradication in the rest of the United States. The Southwest program was started in 1962 and by fiscal year 1965 it was possible to discontinue the annual \$750,000 nonmatching Federal appropriation to protect the Southeast States from reinfestation. Up to that time, it had been necessary to maintain inspection service between the Southwest and the Southeast to keep the Southeast from being reinfected.

The original States in the Southwest program were Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico. A very remarkable job was done in these States and in early 1965 they were declared to be free from any native screw-worm flies. During 1963 and 1964 a strip along the eastern and southern border of Arizona was used as a buffer zone to prevent entry of the fly into the eradication areas of the Southwest program. This buffer zone treatment so reduced the number of screw-worm cases in Arizona that we requested that we be included in the program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture felt it would not be feasible to bring Arizona into the program unless California was included at the same time. This was agreed to, and these States were brought into the program in May of 1965. Appropriations were provided on a matching basis. By getting an early start in 1965, and by conducting an intensified eradication program in Arizona and California, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, on May 15 of this year was able to declare these States free of any native screw-worm population. Department scientists have determined that a period of 11 weeks of freedom from screw-worm is sufficient to prove that the native population has been eradicated. We had no screw-worms in these States between December 13, 1965, and March 21, 1966.

When the Southwest program was started it became necessary for non-Federal sources to provide a substantial portion of the matching funds required by Federal legislation. I believe this committee will be interested to know that livestock producers in all the participating Southwest States have met every cent of their obligations for matching

funds. In Arizona we are just completing our fund drive to complete the 1966 fiscal year. Arizona ranchers have contributed a total of \$350,000 as their portion of the matching requirement.

Senator JORDAN. May I interrupt at that point?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Senator JORDAN. Was that so much per head?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. We recommended \$1 a head on range cattle, and we have just under 400,000 range cattle in Arizona, so you see, we were shooting at a pretty high figure. We did not quite make it. We had a goal of \$300,000, but we had a \$50,000 obligation from the previous fiscal year, so we had to come up with a total of \$350,000, and this was a little over a year's period. So we do think the livestock producers of the Southwest have kept faith with the Congress on their part of the program.

Senator YOUNG. Are there some infestations left in the United States yet? Are there any in New Mexico or Texas?

Mr. DAVIS. Senator, we have had a number of cases in Arizona, for example, this spring. We have had quite a concentration of cattle from Mexico along our Arizona-Mexico line, coming in for shipment into the United States. This has been quite a source of problem for us. The Sonora area has had a pretty severe number of cases, so we have had a kind of chain reaction from that.

We have had—I cannot give you the exact number of cases to date since March 21, but it has been probably 80, 85, 90, something like that.

Senator YOUNG. That is in Arizona?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir, in Arizona.

Senator YOUNG. How about the other States?

Mr. DAVIS. I think there have been a few cases in some of the other States. Texas has had a few, I believe New Mexico has had a few, a handful, maybe.

Senator YOUNG. How far north?

Mr. DAVIS. Just along the line. In Arizona, we had one case in Mojave County, as I recall, which was about—in airline distance, it would be close to 200 miles.

Senator YOUNG. I am talking about Texas, now. Have you found any isolated cases a long way from the border?

Mr. DAVIS. Dr. Anderson could probably answer that. I do not know the exact location in Texas.

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir, there have not been any cases very far from the border. There have been a few in the barrier zone from the U.S. side of the border in Texas. New Mexico, and Arizona, as Mr. Davis mentioned. There have been a very few just outside of the barrier, but adjacent to the barrier zone. It is the opinion of our scientists that these cases were the result of the migration through the barrier from old Mexico.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you.

Dr. ANDERSON. In other words, they are not self sustaining screw-worm populations. These cases are the result of migration from Mexico through the barrier.

Senator YOUNG. I am trying to get an education here in case this comes up in conference with the House on appropriations.

Senator JORDAN. I am glad you are getting all that information. It is interesting to me, too, because it is something I knew a little bit about, though nothing much. I am glad to learn a lot more about it.

Mr. DAVIS. As I have said, the major concern now is for the future of the program. Conceivably a barrier zone along the Mexican border, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean could be maintained. This would require a permanent operation at a relatively high cost. Not high in comparison with the benefits derived, but high in comparison with the other possible alternatives. One other possible alternative is to authorize a cooperative program between the United States and the Republic of Mexico to eradicate the screw-worm southward into Mexico until an effective barrier can be maintained across the narrow part of Mexico, the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, which would be at a fraction of the cost of the present location.

Last year the Congress provided for an extensive field survey to be made in Mexico. This survey has been obtaining information not previously available relating to all aspects of the screw-worm situation in Mexico. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has stated that preliminary results of the survey confirm their earlier opinion that eradication of screw-worms from Mexico is feasible.

If, for just a moment, we want to look even further down the road, it seems entirely possible that instead of stopping at the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and maintaining a barrier at that point, the program could be extended to the Panama Canal. Much interest has been shown by governmental and livestock officials in Central America, and especially in Guatemala. This is a program which holds great potential as an instrument for economic and technical aid to our neighbors to the south.

Public Law 8, passed by the 80th Congress in 1947, established the authority for creating the Mexican-United States Commission for the Prevention of Foot and Mouth Disease. The success of that program is a matter of record. S. 3325, now being considered by this committee, proposes a simple amendment to the foot and mouth disease law to make possible the same kind of cooperative arrangement for the eradication of the screw-worm as was used in the foot and mouth disease program.

Mexican producers and Mexican Government officials have shown a strong desire to participate in screw-worm eradication. The National Livestock Confederation of Mexico has indicated their willingness to participate financially through a per head assessment on cattle sold. Many joint meetings have been held between United States and Mexican officials and organizations. In each case there has been solid agreement that Mexico wants to cooperate.

The immediate need, then, is to authorize a joint program with Mexico. S. 3325 would grant this authority.

This opportunity to express our support for S. 3325 is greatly appreciated, and we respectfully urge your favorable consideration.

I would be glad to answer any questions that I can.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis. It is interesting to me, and I am sure to the whole Congress, the increased interest that producers have, of all the commodities, livestock and other things, in helping themselves. We have this bill in cotton, you know, right now, where there is a producer program entirely to promote cotton. The boll weevil has been one of their problems, too, as you know. This is the reason I asked Dr. Anderson about the boll weevil. It is becoming more and more apparent that the producer needs to help himself to save himself.

I want to commend your association for the fine job you have been doing in helping your own case, in matching and so forth.

Senator, do you have any questions?

Senator YOUNG. I want to say, too, that your members of the Senate from Arizona, Senator Hayden and Senator Fannin and Senator Montoya of New Mexico and others have all been active in your behalf.

Senator JORDAN. I might say you have pretty fine Senators.

Senator YOUNG. If they cannot get any results, there will be no help for you.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Montoya, do you have any questions?

Senator MONTOYA. No, no questions, Senator, thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Young and Senator Montoya, so far as I am personally concerned, I am willing for the subcommittee to report this favorably to the next full committee meeting. Do you have any objection to doing that?

Senator YOUNG. No, I think it should.

Senator MONTOYA. I so move, Mr. Chairman.

Senator YOUNG. I second it.

Senator JORDAN. I will vote "aye," and we will report this favorably to the next full Committee on Agriculture.

Senator MONTOYA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

May I also state that the clerk of the committee be authorized to make any technical corrections in the bill?

Senator JORDAN. Yes, that will be perfectly all right.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Senators. This concludes the hearings.

(Whereupon, at 11:10 a.m., the hearing was concluded.)

(Additional statements filed for the record are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, the Senate Agriculture Committee now has under consideration an important bill, S. 3325, introduced on May 9, 1966 by the distinguished Junior Senator from New Mexico, Senator Montoya. S. 3325 would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with Mexico in a screw-worm eradication program in that country. I feel privileged to be a co-sponsor of the bill.

This legislation is essential to protect cattle producers throughout the United States. For years Texas cattlemen have been familiar with the destructive capabilities of the screw-worm. Multiple infestations of screw-worm flies and larvae cause the death of the animal unless treatment is speedy and thorough. Even when discovered, infestations maim and stunt animals, retard weight gains, and increase the animal's susceptibility to disease.

The problem of the screw-worm in the United States was recognized long ago. Eradication of native screw-worm populations has been accomplished in the Southeast and Southwest States, and most recently in Arizona and California. A barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean along the Mexican border, preventing the entry of screw-worms from Mexico into areas of the United States which have been freed from this pest. The Federal Government bears responsibility for this program because the operations are conducted within the Republic of Mexico with the consent of the Mexican Government.

At the present time 1850 miles of barrier are maintained to halt the introduction of Mexican screw-worms into the United States. The proposal before us today could greatly reduce the cost of this program while insuring the security of our own animals. A survey is being conducted in Mexico to consider eradication of the screw-worm there. Indications are that an effective barrier could be main-

tained across the narrow part of Mexico, the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, for a fraction of the expense of the existing barrier. Coordination and cooperation between Mexico and the United States is essential.

The legislation before us now amends the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Mexican Government in screw-worm eradication. An open-ended authorization is provided; funds must be appropriated by Congress through the regular appropriations process.

I urge the passage of S. 3325 to protect the cattle industry of this country by extending southward the barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies. The expense of the existing program will be reduced while the scope of protection is increased. As a Texan, I realize the great importance of this legislation. I hope that the Committee will act favorably on this bill.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN TOWER, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

The screw-worm eradication program begun four years ago has virtually accomplished its purpose; in 1965, stockmen in Texas and New Mexico reported only 600 infestations, as compared to losses estimated at about \$100 million yearly prior to inauguration of the program.

Even in the first two years of operation, dramatic evidence of its effectiveness became apparent. Screw-worm infestations were reduced 75 percent in the first year; 99 percent the following year. Those who conceived of the program and carried it out deserve our appreciation, because we have all benefited—from cattle raiser to consumer.

But these remarkable results have not been achieved without some expenditure. As I am sure the members of the Committee are aware, the program consists of seeding sterilized screw-worm flies in a buffer zone along the United States-Mexico border.

These flies mate with normal flies which then produce only infertile eggs. The process of sterilization necessitates exposure of the flies to radioactive material, and is somewhat costly to maintain as a program.

A plan has taken shape to carry the belt down into Mexico and seed the area across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, the narrowest point in Mexico. The subject bill, S. 3325 of which I am a co-sponsor, would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the government of Mexico in such a screw-worm eradication program. By seeding at the narrowest point in Mexico, rather than along the comparatively extensive Texas-Mexico border, the cost of the program would be considerably reduced. In addition, even greater protection would be accorded United States livestock. Effective as the present program is, there are still some infestation cases reported in the Rio Grande area near the border.

By moving the belt south, it is conceivable that the protection could be 100% effective—and at reduced cost. The Isthmus of Tehuantepec is 140 to 250 miles in width as compared to the present barrier area of over 2,000 miles.

A field survey to determine the best barrier area in Mexico is presently under way. Considerable research is being undertaken on a cooperative basis between the United States and Mexico to determine the habits of the screw-worm for purposes of more effective eradication procedures.

It is my pleasure to be a sponsor of S. 3325. No additional expenditures are requested or required for this grant of authority. The screw-worm eradication program is not experimental. Its results have already been dramatically demonstrated, and I urge the committee to report the bill with a recommendation that it be enacted into law.

DENVER, Colo., June 21, 1966.

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONTOYA: The American National Cattlemen's Association wholeheartedly endorses your bill, S. 3325.

We feel it will in large measure facilitate the maintenance of a screw-worm-free status in the United States. The insect, as you well know, has been a scourge in your own state of New Mexico as well as across the whole southern part of the

United States. We feel that your amendment to the Act of February 28, 1947 will assist in moving the program of eradication south of our border and by doing so in the long run will considerably lower the continuing costs.

We ask that you please include this letter as a part of the hearing record on S. 3325.

Cordially,

C. W. McMILLAN,
Executive Vice President,
American National Cattlemen's Association.

O

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 89-521

H. R. 14888

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 148881
Digest of Public Law 89-5212

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 14888

May	4, 1966	Rep. Poage introduced H. R. 14888 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
May	9, 1966	Sen. Montoya introduced and discussed S. 3325 which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill and remarks.
May	25, 1966	House committee reported H. R. 14888 with amendments. H. Report 1555. Print of bill and report.
June	6, 1966	House passed H. R. 14888 as reported.
June	7, 1966	H. R. 14888 was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as referred.
June	23, 1966	Senate subcommittee approved S. 3325.
June	28, 1966	Senate committee reported S. 3325 with amendment. S. Report 1342. Print of bill and report.
June	29, 1966	Senate passed H. R. 14888 with an amendment, substituting the language of S. 3325.
July	12, 1966	House concurred in Senate amendments.
July	27, 1966	Approved: Public Law 89-521.

Hearing: S. Agriculture and Forestry Committee
On S. 3325 and H. R. 14888

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-521

SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN MEXICO. Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with Mexico and other public and private organizations and individuals in a joint screw-worm eradication program.

H. R. 14888

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 4, 1966

Mr. POAGE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of section 1 of the Act of February
4 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by inserting "or screw-
5 worm" after the word "rinderpest."

6 Section 2 of the Act of February 28, 1947, is further
7 amended by adding a new section as follows:

8 "SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agri-
9 culture is further authorized to cooperate with other public
10 and private organizations and individuals."

89TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 14888

A BILL

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

By Mr. POAGE

MAY 4, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3325

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 9, 1966

Mr. MONTONA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first section of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61
4 Stat. 7) is amended by striking out in the first sentence “or
5 rinderpest”, and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the
6 following: “rinderpest, or screw-worm”.

7 SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding a
8 new section as follows:

9 “SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agri-

A BILL

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FANNIN,
Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr.
TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH

MAY 9, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

1 culture is further authorized to cooperate with other public
2 and private organizations and individuals.”

nal are the Republic of South Africa, Canada, and Russia.

The approximate acquisition cost of the ruthenium in the inventory was about \$37.30 per troy ounce. The present market value is \$55 to \$60 per troy ounce.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the ruthenium now held in the supplemental stockpile.

DISPOSAL OF VANADIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 13774) to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1152), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 6,450 short tons of vanadium (V content), and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of vanadium is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the material is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal action by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of vanadium covered by this bill is excess to stockpile requirements.

The total inventory of vanadium (V content) held by GSA is 7,865 short tons. The present stockpile objective is 1,400 short tons. The excess of approximately 6,450 short tons is covered by H.R. 13774.

Information on vanadium

Vanadium is a pale gray metal with a silvery luster. It occurs in combination with other minerals or metals, including uranium and phosphate rock. It readily alloys with steel. When added to steel it toughens and strengthens it—forming hard carbides which are retained at high temperatures. Vanadium increases tensile strength without lowering ductility.

The greatest percentage of all vanadium is consumed by the steel industry in the manufacture of high-strength structural steels, tool steels, and wear-resistant cast iron. It is also used in combination with

other alloying materials such as nickel and aluminum.

U.S. vanadium ore is mined principally in the Colorado Plateau as a coproduct of uranium. Other sources in the United States are South Dakota, New Mexico, Idaho, and Utah. Foreign sources of supply are Finland, Republic of South Africa, and South-West Africa.

The vanadium for disposal is stockpile quality material in the form of vanadium pentoxide. The approximate acquisition cost of the vanadium pentoxide inventory was \$1.18 per pound. The average price received for similar vanadium pentoxide sold by GSA in February of this year was approximately \$1.22 per pound.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Federal Government but will result in substantial returns to the Federal Treasury as a consequence of the proceeds of the sale of the vanadium now held in the national stockpile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for assuring expeditious Senate action in these stockpile proposals. Their vitally important nature falls squarely within the national interest. These two Members of this body deserve a great deal of credit for giving the measures swift, yet full committee consideration and for seeing that successful action would be achieved today. To both go our thanks for their continuing excellent work in this field.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomina-

tions are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, U.S. Army, to be a lieutenant general.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, to be lieutenant general on the retired list.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service and in the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

APPOINTMENT OF THE HONORABLE BERNARD BOUTIN AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in public statements today, I have commended the appointment of the Honorable Bernard Boutin as Administrator of the Small Business Administration. President Lyndon B. Johnson announced his selection over the weekend and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business with a vital interest in the stability and health of the smaller businesses of West Virginia and the Nation, I am gratified.

In my statement through West Virginia new media, I declared that I would

urge the Senate to act promptly to confirm the appointment of Mr. Boutin, because his organizing ability and leadership talents are needed by the Small Business Administration.

Mr. President, I do urge early action on confirmation of the executive nomination of the gentleman from New Hampshire whom President John F. Kennedy brought into the Federal Government as Administrator of the General Services Administration. In that position, Mr. Boutin performed vigorously and capably.

After a period of return to private enterprise, Mr. Boutin was brought back into Government, President Johnson having appointed him Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, where his performance was of high quality.

In my Public Works Committee and Labor and Public Welfare Committee duties—and in my service as a Senator from West Virginia—I have been privileged to work cooperatively with Bernie Boutin in both his GSA and OEO assignments.

I feel that President Johnson made a wise decision in selecting him to head the vital Small Business Administration.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the national commander, Civil Air Patrol, Ellington Air Force Base, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1965, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION OF SAN JOSE, CALIF.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Human Relations Commission of the City of San Jose, Calif., relating to the granting of the right of collective bargaining to agricultural farm workers, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 3321. A bill for the relief of Patrick Quisenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 3322. A bill to declare that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3323. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of certain civilian guards at the U.S. Naval Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3324. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MONTOYA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 3325. A bill to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screwworm eradication in Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONTOYA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 3326. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a Talented American Senior Corps; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1947, AS AMENDED

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended. This amendment will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

This proposed legislation is important to the cattle producers throughout the United States. Considerable work has been done to combat this problem, but much more is needed as we look to the future.

Let us review the status of the program as it stands today.

SOUTHEAST SCREW-WORM PROGRAM

In fiscal year 1958, a cooperative program to eradicate the screw-worm from the Southeast was initiated in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. The major screw-worm eradication work was completed during fiscal year 1960 with great economic benefits to that region of the Nation. The primary source of spreading infestations each year to States north of Florida was the overwintering area in southern Florida. This area is surrounded on three sides by water and to the north by a climate which does not allow native screw-worms to survive the winter. The presence of these natural barriers against reinfestation contributed greatly to the success of the Southeastern eradication program.

When major eradication was completed in the Southeastern States it was necessary to protect them from reinfestation. A line of inspection stations was established for this purpose along the Mississippi River to prevent the movement of screw-worm infested animals from the Southwestern States. Maintenance of this protective line required as much as \$750,000 annually in Federal funds without cost-sharing by State or local sources for 4 fiscal years—1961–64. The eradication of the screw-worm from the Southwest made it possible to discontinue this inspection line beginning in fiscal year 1965.

SOUTHWEST SCREW-WORM PROGRAM

Cooperative activities were inaugurated in February 1962 as a 3-year trial eradication program to eliminate screw-worm flies in Arkansas, Louisiana, Ok-

lahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, and concurrently to determine the requirements and the economic feasibility for establishing and maintaining an artificial barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies along the Mexico-United States border that would prevent screw-worms from Mexico from entering screw-worm-free areas of Texas, New Mexico, and States north and east. This has been accomplished.

Maintenance of this barrier is considered to be a Federal responsibility because program operations must be conducted largely within the Republic of Mexico, with the consent of the Mexican Government. Because screw-worms from Mexico can readily migrate across the international boundary, the northern limits of the barrier zone must extend into southern Texas and New Mexico but the distance depends upon various seasonal and climatic influences. Moreover, the barrier is in the same category as the cattle fever tick buffer quarantine zone along the Rio Grande supported by Federal funds.

The Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1966 made available approximately \$2,800,000 for maintenance of a barrier. The major cost-sharing requirement for maintenance of the barrier zone was eliminated from the appropriation language. However, in keeping with congressional intent, the cooperators are required to continue matching the cost of production, irradiation, and release of flies needed to eradicate outbreaks in the freed areas north of the barrier zone.

STATUS OF SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

In the fiscal year 1966 agricultural appropriation bill, Congress made available \$1 million for the Federal share of full-year costs of a program to eradicate screw worms in Arizona and California and to extend the screw-worm barrier west to the Pacific Ocean. The Conference Report No. 1186 on the bill stated that as much as \$600,000 in matching funds would be provided by State or local sources, making a total of \$1,600,000 for this extension of the screw-worm barrier program. The extended program was initiated with supplemental funds of \$100,000 provided under the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965. These supplemental funds made it possible to start eradication activities in May 1965 at about the time of heavy screw-worm migrations from Mexico into the United States, thus preventing the usual screw-worm buildup in Arizona during the late spring. This favorable position made it possible to eradicate the native screw-worm population from Arizona and in California in one season. Even though there are areas where the pest can live all winter, not a single screw worm was reported in Arizona between December 15, 1965, and March 23, 1966. Department scientists have just completed a thorough review of field data and have determined that a period of 11 weeks of freedom from screw-worms is sufficient to prove that the native population has been eradicated. Eradication has been accomplished when, after a period of absence of cases, any new cases

which occur must be introduced from outside the eradicated areas.

PROGRAM OF FUTURE OPERATIONS

With the eradication of native screw-worm populations in Arizona and California, the sterile screw-worm fly drop has been concentrated further south in the barrier zone to reduce the heavy native screw-worm populations in northern Mexico south of Arizona and, thereby, further reduce the number of screw-worms that can migrate into Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and other States during the summer of 1966.

For maximum effectiveness the barrier zone from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean must be maintained as one operation. The maintenance of any portion of the barrier zone is dependent upon the proper maintenance of adjacent portions in order to protect all States.

The prospect of a continuing high annual cost to maintain New Mexico, Texas, and States to the north and east free from screw-worms, makes it essential to find means of reducing the cost and, at the same time, prevent the introduction of screw worm into the United States. An extensive field survey of the situation is being conducted throughout the Republic of Mexico south of the existing artificial barrier zone as far as the Mexican-Guatemala border to determine the problems. Mexico is cooperating in this survey.

This survey is designed to obtain information not presently available relating to first, areas in Mexico favorable to screw-worm breeding; second, natural population densities during different seasons of the year; third, favorable resting areas and dispersal patterns; fourth, varying husbandry practices in different areas of Mexico; and fifth, economic losses in Mexico.

Preliminary results of the survey confirm our earlier opinion that eradication of screw worms from Mexico is feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across the narrow part of Mexico at a fraction of the cost of the present location. After completion of the survey a proposed program, with estimated cost, will be developed for consideration by the two Governments.

The Department does not have authority to cooperate with Mexico in screw-worm eradication. Under Public Law 8 Congress authorized the Department to cooperate with Mexico in the highly successful foot-and-mouth eradication program. The attached proposed amendment would extend this authority to include screw-worm eradication. With such authorization the Department would be authorized to consider a joint program proposal, after which discussions would be held with the Congress.

Mr. President, I request that this bill lie on the desk through Saturday, May 14, for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 3325) to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screwworm eradication in Mexico, introduced Mr. MONTROYA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

AMENDMENT NO. 561

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in recent months it has come to my attention that important health, education, and welfare programs are being placed in jeopardy by an effort on the part of certain Federal officials to correct so-called racial imbalance in the States. I hasten to add that the Federal officials are not solely responsible because they are laboring under legislation, the provisions of which are vague and easily misunderstood. For this reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of an additional title to S. 3296, the administration's proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966. I request unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the ambiguities of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is necessary to avoid further submission of Federal officials to the pressures of outside forces which have compelled them to perform quasi-judicial functions and to allow them to concentrate on their statutory duty.

At the outset, I want to emphasize that this amendment is not intended to change the intent of Congress in enacting title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. On the contrary, it is designed to implement that intent. It is not designed to diminish the decisions of the Federal courts; rather it is designed to rely on those decisions in applying the sanctions of title VI. Nor is it designed to permit unlawful discrimination—it only assists in defining such discrimination.

My amendment would redesignate title VI of S. 3296 as title VII thereof, and redesignate sections 601 and 602 thereof as sections 701 and 702, respectively. Immediately after title V the following new title is inserted: title VI—Civil Rights Act amendment.

This amendment amends title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It would provide in section 606(a) that no funds can be withheld under any Federal program until a constitutional or statutory violation has been committed by the recipient of the benefits of such programs. Furthermore, such violation must be established by substantial evidence.

Subsection (b) provides simply that in making a determination with respect to alleged violations the particular Federal agency must follow the same procedural requirements as in the case of all other administrative adjudications. In the future, the recipient of such benefits must

be accorded not only notice of the intention to withhold funds but also the opportunity to be heard and to present evidence in its own behalf.

Subsection (c) provides that in order to support a determination of discrimination it must be shown that there has been an affirmative intent to exclude or the necessary effect of exclusion of individuals from benefits on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The purpose of this subsection is to negate the application of purely mechanistic and statistical criteria in the determination of discrimination.

Subsection (d) is a protective feature of the rights of potential beneficiaries and prohibits any Federal agency from exercising control over any school, hospital or other institution under the provisions of this title for any purpose other than to provide equal opportunity for access thereto by individuals without regard to race, color, or national origin. Furthermore, this subsection will insure that no class of individuals shall be deprived of the privilege of determining voluntarily whether or not to avail themselves of any benefit provided by any program or activity financed or partially financed by the Federal Government.

Section 601, which is the heart of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, would be left untouched by my amendment. It provides:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The remaining, implementing language of the title, however, brazenly transfers to the Executive the lawmaking power of Congress, and in doing so leaves the definition of discrimination and the application of sanctions to the uncontrolled discretion of agency officials. Congress has meekly surrendered the control of the Federal purse strings to the "equal opportunity officer" of each agency which he may use to effectuate his own notions of sociological progress.

And what has been the result? Not only have many officials predictably taken full advantage of their new power, but indeed some have usurped far more than was given them by the act.

I will mention three examples in North Carolina, only to illustrate how this legislative and judicial power which officials have assumed has resulted in the distortion of the original Federal programs they are charged with administering.

An adult basic education project in Charlotte, under which 1,400 Negroes and 170 whites in a total of 91 classes were being taught to read and write, was threatened with termination by the Office of Economic Opportunity because of alleged de facto segregation and so-called racial imbalance in two classes. This threat, without complaint from any local organization or individual, was made under the provisions of title VI.

In another North Carolina city, a hospital is at this moment under threat of losing Federal funds because nonwhites

do not comprise as large a percentage of the patient load as is the percentage of the nonwhite population of the city. There is no allegation of discrimination or segregation in the staffing, in employment, or in the assignment of patients to wards and rooms. The only allegation is that the local populace does not become ill and choose the threatened hospital according to racial quotas.

Finally, there is the example of the Office of Education integration guidelines recently published for the South. There is no pretense in the language of the guidelines that their purpose is to prevent either discrimination or State-supported segregation. The whole thrust is so-called racial balance in pupil and teacher assignment according to percentages.

These mindless threats and fatuous guidelines cannot be remotely reconciled with the language or the legislative history of title VI or with the unlawful conduct—as defined by the courts—that was intended to be condemned. Two brief statements confirm this.

The best authority on congressional intent of any legislative act is the floor manager of the bill, and the floor manager of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was the then assistant majority leader, Vice President HUMPHREY. In developing the legislative history and articulating the intent of the act, the Vice President stated in 1964:

While the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The busing of children to achieve racial balance would be an act to effect the integration of schools. In fact, if the bill were to compel it, it would be a violation, because it would be handling the matter on the basis of race.

The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools; it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the school systems.

The Vice President meant that the act was designed to eliminate segregation by legal compulsion. His words echoed those of the Federal courts as stated in Briggs against Elliott:

It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided * * *. It has not decided that the Federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the States. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What is has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains.

Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination.

But in not one of the instances I recounted in North Carolina did the Federal official responsible follow either the mandate of the 1964 act or the mandate of the Federal judiciary, or that of the specific poverty, education or health program he was to administer.

In Charlotte, the poverty program official stated his purpose was to "promote maximum cross-cultural experience," ac-

cording to his euphemistic, sociological jargon. The education of hundreds of illiterates, 90 percent of them Negro, was to be sacrificed to the overriding imperative of so-called racial balance. His integration program was of more importance than his poverty program. It was not those who administer nor those who voluntarily teach who would have been hurt—only those to whom the ability to read and write would have been denied.

If the incidence of sickness among nonwhites does not increase sufficiently and more Negroes do not come to our hospitals, so that, thereby, funds are cut off, it is not the hospital trustees nor the staff that will be hurt. It will be the charity patients whom the hospital can no longer afford to treat and many of them are not white. Such tragically insane policies, which completely subvert the purpose of our health-care legislation, cause one to wonder if "all what's nailed down is comin' loose," as the Angel Gabriel said to the Lord in the great play, "Green Pastures."

Such a thought is surely confirmed by the new school desegregation guidelines. In them there is this:

The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether the students are subjected to discrimination in education programs.

And one education official, in explaining these obtuse rules, said:

Race may have to be taken into account in future assignments so as to achieve an integrated balance of staff.

These statements fly blindly in the teeth of every Federal judicial decision concerning equal protection of the laws handed down in the last 20 years—decisions which state unequivocally that race cannot be a constitutionally permissible consideration in the enactment and enforcement of Federal and State laws. To our Office of Education, the Constitution is no longer colorblind. On the contrary, race is the primary consideration in the ground rules of its great drive for so-called racial balance. In ignoring the decisions of the courts, the guidelines equally ignore the intent of title VI. In fact, the sudden emphasis on so-called racial balance among classroom teachers violates the express language of section 604, which States that nothing in the title shall be construed to authorize action by any Federal agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

And, again, who is hurt when a school system fails to achieve a so-called balance satisfactory to Federal officials? Not the school board; not the teacher. The only ones who lose are the students whom the Federal aid to education was designed to help and who have no control whatsoever over assignment policies. Yet the Federal Government would deny to those legally helpless students the equal protection and equal assistance which Federal law provides to all others.

As education bills are brought up in this body, we are admonished time and

again that Federal control of schools is not the intention. I have accepted the assurances in good faith. Just last week the Vice President assured us that Federal aid was intended to—and should—strengthen local school systems. I accept this too. But, Mr. President, this is not the current course of Federal aid, for the program has been twisted into a club held over the heads of all southern school officials and used to enforce Washington's notions of acceptable integration progress.

The amendment I introduce today will prohibit such nonsensical interpretations of their own power under title VI as some Federal officials have divined. It will accomplish this by defining section 601 according to the intent of Congress, and the decisions of the Federal courts; if it is adopted, title VI, in the future, will be implemented according to the intention of Congress and not the whim of bureaucrats who are not answerable to the people for the sociological follies.

If my amendment is adopted, every American will be subject to the same guidelines and can ascertain what those guidelines are. No longer will "discrimination" mean something different in 1 year from what it means in the next as is presently the case. No longer can the title be applied in one section of the country and not in another, without the protections of due process, as is presently the case. No longer will free choice be allowed by one department or agency and not by another, as is presently the case.

Mr. President, I ask all Senators to consider this amendment carefully, for I intend to press it. I am confident that fundamental fairness and equal justice require its enactment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 561) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

On page 35, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new title:

"TITLE VI—CIVIL RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENT

"SEC. 601. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 606. (a) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the termination of, or the refusal to grant or continue, any Federal financial assistance for any cause other than a violation of a provision of the Constitution, or an affirmative provision of a statute of the United States, which has been established by substantial evidence.

"(b) No rule, regulation, or order which may result in the termination of, or the failure to grant or continue, any Federal assistance shall be placed in effect unless it has been adopted after proceedings taken in compliance with the requirements of sections 4-10, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003-1009).

"(c) A determination under this title to the effect that discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin exists, has existed, or in the future may exist, in the administration of any program or activity shall require a showing by substantial evidence that in the administration or opera-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 26, 1966
For actions of May 25, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 86

CONTENTS

Animal research.....	4,27	Great Society.....	19	Reclamation.....	18
Cattle hides.....	5	Information.....	13	Research.....	4,7,27,29
CCC.....	1	Labeling.....	2,28	School milk.....	3
Education.....	12	Labor standards.....	11,20	Screw-worm.....	7
Electrification.....	21	Libraries.....	8	Social security.....	25
Export control.....	5	Loan pools.....	32	Tariff.....	12
Farm labor.....	11,23	Military construction...	1	Transportation.....	30
Farm prices.....	5,17,31	Packaging.....	2	Tree farming.....	22
Food.....	14,17	Parity prices.....	31	Water pollution.....	6
Foreign trade.....	14	Participation sales....	32	Water resources.....	10
Forestry.....	15,22	Personnel.....	25	Wilderness.....	15
Future farmers.....	16	Postal rates.....	9		
Grants-in-aid.....	24	Public debt.....	26		

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported screw-worm eradication bill. Sen. Mondale commended fair packaging-labeling bill, to be debated today. Sen. Muskie introduced and discussed intergovernmental personnel bill.

SENATE

1. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Passed as reported S. 3105, the military construction bill, including an authorization to repay Commodity Credit Corporation for family housing. pp. 10973-81
2. PACKAGING; LABELING. The Commerce Committee was authorized to report during recess S. 985, the fair packaging and labeling bill (p. 10998). Sen. Long said the bill will be debated today and is expected to remain the unfinished business over the Memorial Day recess (p. 10973). Sen. Mondale spoke in support of the bill (pp. 10926-8).

3. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire defended his special milk bill and said he was shocked by USDA opposition to it. p. 10938
4. RESEARCH ANIMALS. Sen. Brewster spoke in favor of S. 2322, to protect research animals. pp. 10944-5
5. FARM PRICES. Sen. Tower recommended S. Con. Res. 88, to prevent the executive branch from engaging in "price-cutting activities affecting agricultural products," and especially objected to export control on cattle hides. p. 10947
6. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Muskie inserted an article criticizing the transfer of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the Interior Department. pp. 10981-2

HOUSE

7. SCREW-WORM. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 14888, to authorize this Department to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico (H. Rept. 1555). ~~p. 10910~~
8. LIBRARIES. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 14050, to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act. p. 10910
9. POSTAL RATES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee filed a supplemental report to H. R. 14904, to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail (H. Rept. 1543, pt II). pp. 10809-10, 10910
10. WATER RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2999, amended, to repeal Sec. 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act relating to Intrastate priority for water users, and H. R. 14312, amended, to increase the authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior. p. D458
11. LABOR STANDARDS. Continued debate on H. R. 13712, making various amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, including its extension to farm labor (pp. 10810-56, 10880, 10897-8). Acted on various amendments to the bill. Rejected, 149-157, an amendment by Rep. Martin to strike the entire agricultural coverage from the bill (pp. 10823-41).
12. EDUCATION. Rep. Curtis spoke in support of the bill to implement the so-called Florence agreement, "an international agreement which provides that signatories remove tariff and other barriers to imported educational, scientific, and cultural materials." pp. 10869-2
13. INFORMATION. Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., criticized the administration's news policy and commended S. 1160, the freedom of information bill. pp. 10883-90
14. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Harvey, Ind., inserted, although he stated he did not agree with its conclusions, an article, "'Strategy Strings' Assailed in Food-for-Freedom Program." pp. 10879-80

SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN MEXICO

MAY 25, 1966.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14888]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 14888) to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike the words "of the" and insert the words "The".

Page 1, line 7, strike the words "adding a new" and insert "amending".

Page 1, line 7, after the word "Section" insert "3 to read".

Page 1, line 8, strike "5" and insert "3".

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 14888 is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Mexican Government in screw-worm eradication in Mexico. Currently the United States is assuming the total burden of conducting an eradication program along our entire border with Mexico which runs some 2,000 miles. A successful eradication program in Mexico could eventually mean the establishment of a much shorter and, therefore, less costly barrier across Mexico, probably at the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In December of 1946, there was an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. By February of 1947, this disease had spread to a large area of Mexico. The presence of this disease in Mexico became

an ominous threat to the livestock in the States that border Mexico. Because the immunity of U.S. livestock was greatly threatened, the Congress took action, and Public Law 8 was approved on February 28, 1947. This act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest (a virile infection of cattle and swine).

By March 17, 1947, the Mexico-United States Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease was organized. Each Government furnished men, money, and materials for the eradication program. Upon completion of the campaign in September of 1952, the Commission's name was changed to the Mexico-United States Commission for the Prevention of Foot-and-Mouth Disease. A brief flareup of the disease occurred in May of 1953 but was soon eradicated. Official notification of eradication took place in December of 1954.

During these 7 years, the United States spent approximately \$134 million, and Mexico spent approximately \$22.5 million in direct contributions. (This figure does not include salaries paid by the Mexican Government or the expenses of the use of approximately 25 percent of the Mexican Army during the project.)

H.R. 14888 would simply add screw-worm to the list of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest. This would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in carrying out the operation or measures to eradicate, suppress or control, or to prevent or retard, screw-worms in Mexico where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States.

In 1958 a cooperative program to eradicate the screw-worm from the Southeastern States was initiated in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. This program, which was based on the use of atomic materials to sterilize male screw-worm flies, has proven highly successful. Major work was completed in 1960. It then became necessary to protect these States from reinfestation; therefore, a line was established along the Mississippi River to prevent screw-worms moving in from the Southwestern United States.

Meanwhile, a program in the Southwestern States started in 1962 with the Department of Agriculture linking with several Southwestern States and the Southwest Animal Health Research Foundation in a cost-sharing screw-worm program. The purpose of this program was to eradicate the screw-worm from Texas and New Mexico and the States to the north and east and to test the feasibility of the establishment of a barrier between the United States and Mexico, preventing a reintroduction of the screw-worm from Mexico into freed areas of the United States. In February of 1964, screw-worms were declared eradicated from Texas and New Mexico. Maintaining this great line along the Mexican border costs the United States approximately \$5.2 million annually.

In view of the threat that screw-worms just across the border in Mexico present to American livestock, and the fact that holding the line (sterile fly barrier zone) of over 2,000 miles costs the United States approximately \$5.2 million per year, the committee feels that the Secretary of Agriculture should be given the same power to cooperate with the Mexican Government in screw-worm eradication

that he presently has in regard to foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpests.

It should be kept in mind that this legislation would not force the Secretary to enter into a program with Mexico. If he were unable to make a fair and suitable arrangement with Mexico, this committee feels that he should not use his authority under this legislation. The committee feels that since both countries would undoubtedly benefit from this legislation, both should assume the costs and obligations involved.

The committee has information that Mexico is very interested in such a mutual program and is currently cooperating with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in conducting a feasibility survey within Mexico.

The committee feels that, in the long run, it would prove far more economical to push the screw-worm back into Mexico, establishing a barrier at a narrow point in the Mexican interior. Eventually, the screw-worm could well be pushed out of Mexico and even out of Central America. Certainly the benefits which would accrue to the United States and Mexico are great.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

The Department of Agriculture reported that it could take no official stand until a survey on the feasibility of a cooperative program with Mexico in the eradication of screw-worms in Mexico is completed. The survey should be completed by July of 1967.

The Department does indicate, however, that preliminary results from the survey indicate that eradication of screw-worms from Mexico will probably be feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across another more narrow part of Mexico.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The amendments adopted by the committee are all of a technical nature and do not change the substantive provisions of the bill.

HEARINGS

Hearings were held on May 20, 1966, on H.R. 14888, by Mr. Poage; H.R. 14930, by Mr. de la Garza; and H.R. 15031, by Mr. Walker of New Mexico. There was no opposition to the bills expressed during the hearings.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1947, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agri-

culture is authorized to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, or control, or to prevent or retard, foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest or *screw-worm* in Mexico where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States. In performing the operations or measures herein authorized, the Government of Mexico shall be responsible for the authority necessary to carry out such operations or measures on all lands and properties in Mexico and for such other facilities and means as in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture are necessary. The measure and character of cooperation carried out under this Act on the part of the United States and on the part of the Government of Mexico, including the expenditure or use of funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Arrangements for the cooperation authorized by this Act shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State. The authority contained in this Act is in addition to and not in substitution for the authority of existing law.

* * * * *

SEC. 3.¹ *In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals.*

¹ Sec. 3 of the act of February 28, 1947, was repealed by sec. 1(20) of Public Law 86-533, approved June 29, 1960.

Union Calendar No. 697

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14888

[Report No. 1555]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 4, 1966

Mr. POAGE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MAY 25, 1966

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of section 1 of the Act of February
4 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by inserting "or screw-
5 worm" after the word "rinderpest."

6 Section 2. ~~of the~~ *The* Act of February 28, 1947, is fur-
7 ther amended by ~~adding a new~~ *amending* section 3 to read
8 as follows:

1 “SEC. 5 3. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of
2 Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other
3 public and private organizations and individuals.”

Union Calendar No. 697

89TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 14888

[Report No. 1555]

A BILL

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

By Mr. Poage

MAY 4, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MAY 25, 1966

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 7, 1966
For actions of June 6, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 92

CONTENTS

Agriculture budget.....16	Lands.....13,28	Roads.....33
Animal research.....22	Legislative program.....12	School lunch.....47
Appropriations....11,12,27	Library services.....25	Screw-worm eradication...2
Claims.....6	Livestock.....44	Statute of limitations...6
Clean air.....43	Loans.....28	Supergrades.....8
Commodity reserve.....20	Manpower.....36,46	Taxation.....35
Cooperatives.....23	Military service.....15	Tobacco allotments.....3
Disaster relief.....1	Milk.....24,37	Transportation..9,14,33,34
Education.....5,36	Organization.....34,35	Veterans.....15
Electrification.....21,23	Park.....45	Water pollution.....17,39
Flood control.....32	Personnel.....8,31	Watersheds.....18
Foreign aid.....10,26	Reclamation.....7,42	Wheat certificates.....4
Foreign trade.....19	Research.....22,41	
Inspection services.....29	River basin.....38	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bills for: Screw-worm eradication. Extension of time to file tobacco-allotment leases. Expeditious issuance of wheat certificates. Additional supergrade positions. Conferees announced agreement on bill to permit alternate crops in case of disaster. Sen. Ellender introduced and discussed child nutrition bill.

HOUSE

1. **DISASTER RELIEF.** The conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 15151, to permit the planting of alternate crops on acreage which is unplanted because of natural disaster. The conferees agreed to omit the Senate limitation of \$10,000 on individual payments. pp. D492-3
2. **SCREW-WORM ERADICATION.** Passed as reported H. R. 14888, to authorize this Department to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico. pp. 11647, 11667-8

3. TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS. Passed as reported H. R. 15124, to provide that any lease or transfer of a tobacco allotment shall be effective, notwithstanding failure to file a copy with the county committee prior to the closing date, if compliance was agreed to prior to the closing date and the terms of the lease are filed with the county office not later than July 31 of any year. p. 11649
4. WHEAT CERTIFICATES. Passed without amendment H. R. 15089, to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate the July 1966 parity price for wheat in order to expedite the issuance of wheat marketing certificates to complying wheat farmers. Under present law the certificates may not be issued until the exact July parity price is determined. p. 11649
5. EDUCATION. Passed, 194-89, under suspension of the rules, H. R. 14643, to authorize HEW to make grants to establish centers for advanced international studies and to strengthen undergraduate programs in international studies. pp. 11650-67
6. CLAIMS. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 13650, to increase to \$25,000 the amount of a claim which Government agencies may settle under the Federal Tort Claims Act. pp. 11668-70
Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 13651, to authorize Government agencies to compromise claims up to \$5,000 under joint regulations of the Attorney General and the Comptroller General. pp. 11670-1
Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 13652, to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government. pp. 11671-2
Passed under ssuspension of the rules H. R. 14182, to provide that when the Government loses a lawsuit, a judgment for cost may be awarded the prevailing party. p. 11672
7. RECLAMATION. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 14312, to increase the authorization for appropriations to continue the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri River Basin. pp. 11682-3
8. SUPERGRADES. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 2393, to authorize additional supergrade positions. As amended in the House, the bill provides for 300 additional positions to be distributed by the Civil Service Commission, in addition to 156 non-USDA positions which are allocated to specific departments and agencies by the bill. The bill also removes the limitation on the number of supergrade jobs which may be allocated at GS-17 or GS-18. pp. 11683-6
9. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Younger inserted an address favoring establishment of a Department of Transportation. pp. 11700-4
10. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Pepper recommended against continuing the furnishing of food to Egypt. pp. 11727-8
11. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 15456 (H. Rept. 1608) on June 3 during adjournment. p. 11730
12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Today the House is to consider the Private Calendar and the legislative appropriation bill. pp. D491-2

all, by action of this body a few years ago that latter department was required by an amendment to see that there will never be more employees in the Department of Agriculture than there are farmers in the United States. We are getting dangerously close to it. But comparing apples with oranges does not impress one.

Will the gentleman say that the positions involved could be established under the general authority of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 instead of by this unanimous consent method?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. We need this method in order to create a position of Assistant Postmaster General. There are five now. This would be the sixth one. It will bring this Department, which we are talking about, up to a sub-Cabinet level.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman infer that this sub-Cabinet level position would be different from what can be done under the Federal Salary Act, in the opinion of the gentleman from Montana? It seems to me we could have legislation authorizing an additional Assistant Postmaster General. After all, the Director of Research and Development and Test and Evaluation in the Defense Department is an Assistant Secretary of Defense for R. & D., T. & E. as in the three military services. Will the gentleman go a little further into why this cannot be done under the Federal Salary Reform Act and still accomplish the same purpose? I am interested primarily as a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I must confess I do not know why it cannot be done. But we are advised that this is the method we should take legislatively in order to bring this to a sub-Cabinet level. That is advice from the people involved.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman concur in the statement in the report that it will amount to \$130,000 at present salary rates for the new positions, including the Assistant Postmaster for R. & E.?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Yes. This is the top level, \$130,000 a year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, some of us would like to be assured, if it is possible to give us assurance, that the creation of the office of another Postmaster General will result in either greater efficiency in the distribution and collection of mail, or in economy to the taxpayers.

We are finding in all too many instances that millions of dollars have been spent for automation, allegedly to increase efficiency and thus reduce employment. But, on the other hand, the payroll of the Federal Government is going up by leaps and bounds. Apparently it does not mean very much in many instances to create these new jobs, or go to automation.

We are not reducing the cost of Government. We are not increasing efficiency in all too many instances.

I believe some of us would like to have an assurance in this regard.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield further?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I wish to say that we are really rather positive on both sides of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that this legislation will result in a reduced unit cost of moving the mail. The mail is coming on us in such a great avalanche that indeed we have to mechanize even to move it. If this legislation is passed, we believe we will be able to do not only the necessary mechanization but also a better job in reducing the unit cost of moving the mail.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the population explosion. I am well aware of the increased needs in regard to communication. I am well aware of the failure of the Post Office Department to deliver the mail as efficiently as it did even a few years ago.

I am a little tired and grow weary of hearing those who constantly say in the executive branch that certain areas have met the requirement for door-to-door delivery, yet that must be put off because the "stingy Congress" will not provide the necessary funds, when their funds and personnel—including the pay thereof—mount annually in at least an arithmetical progression.

I am even more leery of establishing new positions and additional personnel for more research, when research is built on vertical blocks, from basic to applied to developmental type research rather than horizontally and simultaneously in all areas.

If the committee is unanimous in this opinion on both sides of the aisle, and if there is a promise from the gentleman that it will not be more expensive than stated, in view of the obvious need to expedite the delivery of mail in these days when we see days off and compensatory time and no delivery of bulk mail 2 days a week, greater costs to parcel post, and so forth, which are constantly cutting down the service to the people at the same time we are increasing personnel; being scientific and research minded, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13822

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to encourage, advance, and accelerate the research and development and construction engineering programs of the Post Office Department and to provide for improvements in the administration of such programs.

SEC. 2. Section 305 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 305. Assistant Postmasters General

"Six Assistant Postmasters General appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such duties as the Postmaster General designates."

SEC. 3. Section 303(d)(21) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 418;

5 U.S.C. 2211(d)(21)) is amended by striking out "Assistant Postmaster General (5)," and inserting in lieu thereof "Assistant Postmasters General (6)."

SEC. 4. Section 303(e) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 419; 5 U.S.C. 2211(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking out

"(60) Director, Office of Research and Engineering, Post Office Department," and inserting in lieu thereof

"(60) Director, Research and Development, Post Office Department."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(101) Director, Construction Engineering, Post Office Department."

SEC. 5. Subsection (e) of the first section of the Act of August 1, 1947 (Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 1161 (e)), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Postmaster General is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than six scientific or professional positions in the Post Office Department, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development and construction engineering functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14888) to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to know if passage of this bill will institute the open-end provision, so far as funds are concerned, for the eradication of the screw-worm under the agreement between this country and Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, evidently no one is present on the floor to answer the question. If this applies only to the elimination of the screw-worm, that is a feature which must be taken care of. There is no report from the Department of Agriculture, although I understand some of the report of the committee is based on a letter from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE SOUTHERN NEVADA PROJECT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2999) to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2999

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section

6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (Act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)) is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (Act of October 22, 1965; 79 Stat. 1068) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. The contract for delivery of water and repayment of reimbursable construction costs of the Southern Nevada Water Project required by section 3 of this Act shall provide that it, within five years from the date of this Act, Basic Management, Inc., and/or the Las Vegas Valley Water District apply for contracts for the storage and delivery of water in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project (45 Stat. 1060, as amended; 43 U.S.C. 617d) and the regulations of the Secretary of the Interior heretofore issued pursuant to said Act, the rights of the party contracting pursuant to section 3 of this Act shall be subordinate to those of Basic Management, Inc., and/or the Las Vegas Valley Water District to the extent of 41,266 acre-feet per annum and 15,407 acre-feet per annum, respectively, or so much thereof as is required for beneficial consumptive use by them, their rights to the storage and delivery of the same having been properly maintained in accordance with the terms of their contracts. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as affecting the satisfaction of present perfected rights as defined by the decree of the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona versus California*, 376 U.S. 340."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (Act of October 22, 1965; 79 Stat. 1068)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACCEPT A DONATION BY THE STATE OF INDIANA OF THE GEORGE ROGERS CLARK MEMORIAL FOR ESTABLISHMENT AS THE GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9599) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for maintenance by the United States as a national historic site.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in 1939 President Franklin D. Roosevelt vetoed this proposal on the basis that the original act called upon the great State of Indiana to keep this monument in perpetuity and to maintain it.

I wonder what is the purpose of this bill and why a change should be made at this time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is right. As written the legislation would override the principle that was in the veto of the then President of the United States.

The reason that this legislation is now before us is that we have had an entirely different atmosphere created because of the condition of this particular memorial. It is being visited more and more by citizens all over the United States. We have tied it in with three other facilities which will be operated in unison, although the other facilities will be under the control of the local groups. This unit of historic facilities is truly a national historic memorial. Those appearing before the committee made a very good presentation that this memorial had just as much right to be so classified, and in some particulars more so than many of the other facilities we have in this category.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, approve of this grouping by the National Park Service of several monuments under one administration? Is this in the interest of efficiency and economy?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will yield again, I do and the committee does. We think that this maintains a national complex but still permits those who have control of these particular facilities to operate them. By their telling of the story of early Indiana and the early Middle West, these can go together very nicely in this particular.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman feels that even the projected amount involved in this bill would not exceed our criteria of over \$1 million?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. Not only that, but we have made the record that fees will be charged, as fees are now being charged, which will help to take care of the expenses of operation and maintenance of the George Rogers Clark Memorial itself.

Mr. HALL. It would be the same as charging fees and admissions to children entering the Neosho National Fish Hatchery?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. There would not be any fees charged to children.

Mr. HALL. I will tell the gentleman that they are being charged starting the first of this month in the district I represent.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill—H.R. 9599—which we have before us at this time would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the George Rogers Clark Memorial from the State of Indiana for maintenance as a national historic site.

The memorial was constructed in Vincennes, Ind., between 1929 and 1936 with funds provided by the State of Indiana, Knox County, and the city of Vincennes, as well as with some Federal funds. It is dedicated as a memorial to George Rogers Clark who, it is generally agreed among historians, played a critical role in the American Revolution on the northwestern frontier. His leadership of American forces in the area ultimately

resulted in the cession of the Northwest Territory by Great Britain.

There are several other important historical structures in the vicinity of the proposed national historical site which may ultimately be included in the historical park under the legislation as amended by the committee. We have received communications indicating that it is likely that the owners of the capitol of the Territory of Indiana and of St. Francis Xavier Cathedral will enter into appropriate cooperative agreements so that the Secretary can assist in their interpretation, preservation and renewal. In addition, it is hoped that a similar arrangement can be agreed upon with the owners of Grouseland—the home of William Henry Harrison while he was Governor of the Territory of Indiana. Inclusion of these structures is, however, contingent upon the voluntary agreements between the owners and the Secretary of the Interior.

Because the State of Indiana is donating its interest in this site, Mr. Speaker, the cost involved in this proposal is nominal. No land acquisition costs are contemplated and it is estimated that the development costs will amount to about \$300,000.

It pleases me, personally and as chairman of the authorizing committee, to have this opportunity to recommend legislation sponsored by our colleague from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]. His efforts, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, have helped to make possible the sound, progressive national park program which we have underway. It is a pleasure to work with my friend from Indiana in authorizing these projects and to work with him to make them a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the approval of H.R. 9599.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States the donation by the State of Indiana of title to the real property comprising the George Rogers Clark Memorial located in Vincennes, Indiana, and such other real and personal property in connection therewith as the Secretary of the Interior may determine to be necessary to maintain such memorial as a national historic site.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, shall administer, protect, develop, and maintain such memorial and such other real or personal property in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following language:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the donation by the State of Indiana of approximately seventeen acres

Mr. Celler and Mr. Daniel for, with Mr. Berry against.
Mr. Zablocki and Mr. Minish for, with Mr. Murray against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Malliard.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Macdonald with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Stalbaum with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Senger with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Grider with Mr. Hesnick.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Helstoski.
Mr. Krebs with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Dow.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Toll with Mr. St Germain.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Farnum with Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. COLLIER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho and Mr. MATTHEWS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

No. 92—4

SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN MEXICO

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today there was an objection when the request was made to consider H.R. 14888.

I have discussed the matter with some of those who were interested, and I now renew the request.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 14888) to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the gentleman's coordination and work on this bill in the interim since first called on the Consent Calendar. I renew the questions I asked when the unanimous consent was granted during the reading of the Consent Calendar to put the bill over without prejudice.

Is this an open-ended authorization for eradication of the screw-worm?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, in exactly the same way as hoof and mouth and rinderpest are now. That means the Appropriations Committee could appropriate certain sums from year to year as they deem necessary, but it does not provide any funds whatsoever until such time as the funds are appropriated.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it would require an annual appropriation for these funds for foot and mouth disease and rinderpest and screw-worm—if this is added—by the simple process of amendment of the original act?

Mr. POAGE. It would require an annual appropriation, yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, is there any estimate or evidence of good faith that Mexico would match funds with us in an attempt to eliminate this, or at least meet in part the expense of the irradiation of these male screw-worms in order to try to transmute their effectiveness in the future and eliminate the disease, as indeed we have done so well in the southeastern States of the United States?

Mr. POAGE. About 1 month ago there was a meeting in the city of Mexico between a number of American cattlemen and Mexican cattlemen. The Mexican cattlemen said their Government was now ready, and they too were ready, to bear a share of this cost. Frankly, there has been no specific plan worked out for payment. That will take some time, but it cannot be done unless we pass the bill.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman have any estimate of what the annual cost or appropriation might be for the first, second, and third year of the program?

Mr. POAGE. It is costing today approximately half a million dollars a year to maintain the quarantine. We think the whole program in Mexico would probably cost approximately a million and a half dollars for the first 2 years.

After that time we could expect to maintain the quarantine for a great deal

less than the cost of maintaining it today. We are now maintaining it on about 1,850 miles of line. We could cut down about 150 miles of line and drive if we drove the screw-worm back to the Isthmus of Tehauntepec.

That is the most attractive feature of the whole program, the endeavor to establish a much shorter line than we have had over the years. The Mexican border is long and crooked at the present time. There is a point at which one can maintain a much cheaper line, down on the isthmus.

Mr. HALL. I have one additional question.

As the gentleman knows, and as the members of the committee know, there is no statement by the Department of Agriculture in the committee report. Under the rules of the objectors on both sides of the aisle, this is one of the requirements. Could the gentleman explain whether the Department of Agriculture favors this bill?

Mr. POAGE. The reason there is no report is that this matter came to our attention after the meeting of the cattlemen of which I spoke in Mexico City. We are acting in the hope that we could get this done before the beginning of the fiscal year. If we do not, there will not be funds to carry on the program.

In that hope, the bill was introduced immediately. In fact, several bills have been introduced, but this bill was reported by the committee. The bill was introduced immediately, and we asked the Department for a report. Instead, they sent Dr. Meyers up to the committee. I have before me the testimony of Dr. Meyers in which he says that the Department has felt it could work out a reasonable arrangement, but did not have time to work up a formal report.

Mr. HALL. Is it important that this be done before the end of fiscal year 1966?

Mr. POAGE. We believe it is quite important. There is only one more Consent Calendar day between now and the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstance of the emergency, and in view of the excellent work which has been done in our Southeastern States to eradicate the screw-worm, considering the explanation of the gentleman, plus having an opportunity to read the report of Dr. Meyers of the Department of Agriculture, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14888

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1 of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by inserting "or screw-worm" after the word "rinderpest."

Section 2 of the Act of February 28, 1947 is further amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike the words "of the" and insert the words "The".

Page 1, line 7, strike the words "adding a new" and insert "amending".

Page 1, line 7, after the word "section" insert "3 to read".

Page 1, line 8, strike "5" and insert "3".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT TO AUTHORIZE INCREASED AGENCY CONSIDERATION OF TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13650) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes, with the committee amendments printed in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13650

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (a) That the first paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The head of each Federal agency or his designee, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, may consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, compromise, and settle any claim for money damages against the United States for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the agency while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred: *Provided*, That any award, compromise, or settlement in excess of \$25,000 shall be effected only with the prior written approval of the Attorney General or his designee."

(b) The second paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of this title relating to civil actions on tort claims against the United States, any such award, compromise, settlement, or determination shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government, except when procured by means of fraud."

(c) The third paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Any award, compromise, or settlement in an amount of \$2,500 or less made pursuant to this section shall be paid by the head of the Federal agency concerned out of appropriations available to that agency. Payment of any award, compromise, or settlement in an amount in excess of \$2,500 made pursuant to this section or made by the Attorney General in any amount pursuant to section 2677 of this title shall be paid in a manner similar to judgments and compromises in like causes and appropriations or funds available for the payment of such judgments and compromises are hereby made available for the payment of awards, compromises, or settlements under this chapter."

Sec. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 2675 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) An action shall not be instituted upon a claim against the United States for money damages for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, unless the claimant shall have first presented the claim to the appropriate Federal agency and his claim shall have been finally denied by the agency in writing and sent by certified or registered mail. The failure of an agency to make final disposition of a claim within six months after it is filed shall, at the option of the claimant any time thereafter, be deemed a final denial of the claim for purposes of this section. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to such claims as may be asserted under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by third party complaint, cross-claim, or counterclaim."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 2675 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by deleting the first sentence thereof.

Sec. 3. Section 2677 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Attorney General or his designee may arbitrate, compromise, or settle any claim cognizable under section 1346(b) of this title after the commencement of an action thereon."

Sec. 4. The first paragraph of section 2678 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"No attorney shall charge, demand, receive, or collect for services rendered, fees in excess of 25 per centum of any judgment rendered pursuant to section 1346(b) of this title or any settlement made pursuant to section 2677 of this title, or in excess of 20 per centum of any award, compromise, or settlement made pursuant to section 2672 of this title."

Sec. 5. (a) Subsection (b) of section 2679 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The remedy against the United States provided by sections 1346(b) and 2672 of this title for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death, resulting from the operation by any employee of the Government of any motor vehicle while acting within the scope of his office or employment, shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against the employee or his estate whose act or omission gave rise to the claim."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 4116 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The remedy against the United States provided by sections 1346(b) and 2672 of title 28 for damages for personal injury, including death allegedly arising from malpractice or negligence of a physician, dentist, nurse, pharmacist, or paramedical (for example, medical and dental technicians, nursing assistants, and therapists) or other supporting personnel in furnishing medical care or treatment while in the exercise of his duties in or for the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against such physician, dentist, nurse, pharmacist, or paramedical or other supporting personnel (or his estate) whose act or omission gave rise to such claim."

Sec. 6. Section 1302 of the Act of July 27, 1956, as amended (70 Stat. 694, 75 Stat. 416; 31 U.S.C. 724a), is further amended (1) by inserting a comma and the word "awards," after the word "judgments" and before the word "and"; (2) by deleting the word "or" after the number "2414" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma; and (3) by inserting after the number "2517" the phrase ", 2672, or 2677".

Sec. 7. Subsection (b) of section 2401 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) a tort claim against the United States shall be forever barred unless it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within two years after such claim accrues or unless action is begun within six months after the date of mailing, by certified or registered mail, of notice of final denial of claim by the agency to which it was presented."

Sec. 8. The first sentence of section 2671 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "as used in this chapter and sections 1346(b) and 2401(b) of this title, the term 'Federal agency' includes the executive departments, the military departments, independent establishments of the United States, and corporations primarily acting as instrumentalities or agencies of the United States, but does not include any contractor with the United States."

Sec. 9. (a) The section heading of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2672. Administrative adjustment of claims"

(b) The analysis of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 2671 of such title, is amended by deleting the item

"2672. Administrative adjustment of claims of \$2,500 or less."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"2672. Administrative adjustment of claims."

Sec. 10. This Act shall apply to claims accruing six months or more after the date of its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is one of a series of four forwarded to our committee by executive communication. The bills were introduced in accordance with the recommendations of the Department of Justice.

These four bills have a common purpose, and that purpose is to provide a more fair and equitable treatment for private individuals and claimants when they deal with the Government or are involved in litigation with their Government.

This bill, H.R. 13650, provides for settlement of tort claims under certain considerations.

The Attorney General now, under the present law, may settle any and all claims against the U.S. Government after suit is filed. This bill will give authority to various governmental agencies to settle claims up to \$25,000 before a suit is filed.

These settlements would be made under regulations promulgated by the Attorney General. Above \$25,000 the Attorney General would have to give his actual written authority for a settlement to be made. The object, really, is to settle claims against the U.S. Government fairly expeditiously and prevent unnecessary lawsuits. At the same time, it would expedite not only the claim by the claimant and individual citizen, but it would save him costs and save the Government costs and expense. The overall cost of litigation would probably

H. R. 14888

AN ACT

H. R. 14888

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 7, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of section 1 of the Act of February
4 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by inserting "or screw-
5 worm" after the word "rinderpest."

6 SECTION 2. The Act of February 28, 1947, is further
7 amended by amending section 3 to read as follows:

8 "SEC. 3. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of
9 Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other
10 public and private organizations and individuals."

Passed the House of Representatives June 6, 1966.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

80TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 14888

AN ACT

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

JUNE 7, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 24, 1966
For actions of June 23, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 103

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	24	Fish protein.....	2	Roads.....	6
Air pollution.....	5	Food prices.....	28	School milk.....	9
Animal research.....	13,16	Foreign aid.....	15	Screw-worm.....	4
Area redevelopment.....	32	Foreign trade.....	10	Tariff.....	14,33
Balance-of-payments.....	8	Housing.....	31,34	Technology.....	27
Banking.....	17	Livestock marketing.....	21	Transportation.....	7
Community development.....	18	Loans.....	36	Vehicles.....	3
Cooperatives.....	21	Milk.....	9	Water pollution.....	5
Defense production.....	1	Ombudsman.....	12	Water resources.....	23
Drought.....	30	Postal service.....	25	Watersheds.....	19,20
Economics.....	26	Poverty.....	35	Wheat.....	37
Education.....	29	Recreation.....	20		
Farm program.....	11	Research.....	13,16,22,27		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate subcommittee approved screw-worm eradication bill. House committee reported foreign aid authorization bill. Rep. Dole criticized administration's alleged holding of watershed applications. House committee voted to report community development districts bill. Rep. Ullman introduced and discussed bill requiring USDA report on import and export of agricultural commodities. Sen. Holland introduced and discussed measure to remove certain agricultural products from consideration for tariff reductions.

SENATE

1. **DEFENSE PRODUCTION.** The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 14025, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 (S. Rept. 1303). p. 13422
2. **FISH PROTEIN.** The Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 2720, authorizing programs to develop practicable means for the production of fish protein concentrate (S. Rept. 1304). p. 13422

3. VEHICLES. The Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 3005, to establish motor vehicle safety standards (S. Rept. 1301) (p. 13422), and the bill was made the pending business of the Senate (p. 13534).
4. SCREW-WORM. A subcommittee of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved for full committee consideration S. 3325, to authorize this Department to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico. p. D564
5. WATER AND AIR POLLUTION. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 2947, to improve and make more effective certain programs under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and S. 3112, authorizing grants under the Clean Air Act for maintenance of air pollution control programs. p. D564
Several Senators were added as cosponsors to S. 3112, to amend the Clean Air Act. p. 13422
Sen. Bartlett expressed concern over "radioactive contamination and pollution" of air and water and inserted articles on the subject. pp. 13411-21
6. ROADS. Sen. Yarborough submitted and discussed an amendment to S. 3155, the road authorization bill, that maximum effort should be made in carrying out the provisions of the Federal-aid highway program to preserve parklands and historic sites. pp. 13430-1
7. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Young, Ohio, spoke "strongly opposing recent attempts to increase tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway," and inserted an editorial on the subject. p. 13433
8. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS. Sen. Dirksen commended and inserted several articles discussing a balance-of-payments report prepared by the International Economic Policy Association. pp. 13442-7
9. MILK. Sen. Proxmire urged early enactment of legislation extending the school milk program and expressed the hope that "the program gets \$115 million in this year's agriculture appropriations bill." p. 13447
Sen. Boggs inserted an article, "Washington Background: Federal Controls at a Snail's Pace," on the "problems caused by the Department of Agriculture's delay in reaching a decision involving possible changes in the Delaware Valley milk marketing order." pp. 13458-9
10. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Thurmond inserted a Reader's Digest article, "Should We Be Trading With the Reds?" pp. 13456-7
Sen. Burdick noted that "Canadian farmers will receive an estimated \$800 million for their wheat shipped to Russia over the next 3 years," criticized the U. S. wheat shipping restriction and inserted an article, "Against the U. S. Grain." p. 13467
11. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Young, N. Dak., inserted two speeches by Sen. Allott on the "problems" of farmers and ranchers. pp. 13461-5
12. OMBUDSMAN. Sen. Long, Mo., inserted a report advocating the adoption by the U. S. of the "ombudsman idea," an administrative counsel of the Congress. pp. 13465-6



DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 29, 1966
For actions of June 28, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 106

CONTENTS

Air pollution.....	24	Foreign aid.....	23	Organization.....	30
Appropriations.....	1,14	Foreign trade.....	26	Personnel.....	21
Civil defense.....	3	Grain standards.....	9	Reclamation.....	5,17,29
Conservation.....	29	Housing.....	4	Recreation.....	16
Continuing		Labeling.....	8,32	Research.....	10,24
appropriations.....	1	Labor.....	6,30	School milk.....	22
Cooperatives.....	27	Libraries.....	2	Screw-worm.....	12
Cotton.....	13	Manpower.....	18,34	Small business.....	28
Education.....	33	Marketing.....	8	Transportation.....	7
Electrification.....	20,27	Milk.....	22	Water resources....	5,15,24
Employment.....	31	National park.....	19		
Farm program.....	25	Opinion poll.....	11		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses passed continuing appropriations resolution. Senate subcommittee approved agricultural appropriation bill. Senate committee reported screw-worm eradication bill. Senate adopted conference report on cotton research-promotion bill. Sen. Proxmire spoke in favor of school milk program.

HOUSE

1. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Both Houses passed H. J. Res. 1180, the continuing appropriations resolution. This measure will now be sent to the President. Sen. Russell, Ga., stated this resolution "is the usual type of resolution which comes before the Senate each year...from the House and is necessary to continue projects and activities of the Government until the appropriations bills are enacted into law. All authority under this resolution expires August 31, 1966." pp. 13843-44, 13874-94

2. LIBRARIES. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 14050, to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13894-5, 13945
3. CIVIL DEFENSE. Passed without amendment H. R. 13125, to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended. p. 13898
4. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 15890, amended, to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas, and to improve and amend our housing programs. p. D587
5. WATER. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 4671, amended, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project. p. D588
6. LABOR STANDARDS. Rep. Farnsley inserted an article, "Almost a Whole Loaf for Labor," commending passage of the minimum wage bill. p. 13942
7. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Mink spoke in support of the proposed Department of Transportation and the advantages such a department would provide Hawaii. pp. 13943-4
8. MARKETING. Rep. Tunney urged enactment of legislation to provide adequate protection for consumers with regard to labeling and packaging. p. 13945
9. GRAIN STANDARDS. Received from this Department a proposed bill to provide for U. S. standards and a uniform national inspection system for grain; to Agriculture Committee. p. 13948
10. RESEARCH. Rep. Hanna paid tribute to the University of California and its agricultural programs. pp. 13904-31
11. OPINION POLL. Rep. Martin, Ala., inserted the results of a questionnaire including items of interest to this Department. p. 13947

SENATE

12. SCREW-WORM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 3325, to authorize this Department to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico (S. Rept. 1342). ~~p. 13776~~
13. COTTON. Received and agreed to conference report on H. R. 12322, the cotton research and promotion bill. p. 13780
14. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration, H. R. 14596, fiscal 1967 appropriations for this Department, and related agencies. p. D585
15. WATER RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 3186, to increase the authorization for continuing work on the Missouri River Basin Project (S. Rept. 1340); voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3034, to authorize feasibility studies of certain potential Federal reclamation projects in 17 Western States; and voted to report (but did

COOPERATION WITH MEXICO ON SCREW-WORM ERADICATION

JUNE 28, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MONTROYA, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 3325]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3325) to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill (as amended) do pass.

S. 3325 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Mexican Government in screw-worm eradication in Mexico. Currently the United States is assuming the total burden of conducting an eradication program along our entire border with Mexico which runs some 2,000 miles. A successful eradication program in Mexico could eventually mean the establishment of a much shorter and, therefore, less costly barrier across Mexico, probably at the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

The legislation is further explained in the attached favorable report from the Department of Agriculture. Also attached is the report from the Department of State recommending enactment of the bill. A companion bill, H.R. 14888, passed the House June 6, 1966. The committee amendment is technical.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1966.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of May 16, 1966, requesting our views on S. 3325. The bill is entitled, "To

amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico."

This Department recommends enactment of S. 3325.

Under Public Law 80-8, this Department was authorized to cooperate with Mexico in the highly successful foot-and-mouth disease eradication program. The amendment proposed by S. 3325 would extend this authority to include screw-worm eradication.

Cooperative screw-worm activities were started in the Southwest in February 1962 as a 3-year trial program. The objectives of the program were (1) to eliminate screw-worm flies in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico; and (2) to determine the requirements and the economic feasibility for establishing and maintaining an artificial barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies along the Mexican-United States border. These two objectives have been accomplished.

The Federal Government has been given the responsibility by law and regulation to prevent the introduction of foreign pests into the United States. Therefore, maintenance of the barrier zone is a Federal responsibility.

In fiscal year 1966, a full-scale program was initiated to eradicate screw-worms in Arizona and to extend the screw-worm barrier west to the Pacific Ocean. Under the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, funds were made available to start eradication activities in May 1965. The early start helped to prevent the usual heavy screw-worm migrations from Mexico into the United States, making it possible to eradicate the native screw-worm population from Arizona and California in less than 1 year. Not a single screw-worm was reported in Arizona between December 15, 1965, and March 23, 1966, even though there are areas where the pest can live all winter.

After eradication was achieved in Arizona and California, the sterile screw-worm fly drop was concentrated farther south in the barrier zone to reduce the heavy native screw-worm populations in northern Mexico south of Arizona. This should reduce the number of screw-worms that migrate into Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and other States during the summer of 1966.

At present, the screw-worm program consists of operation of the barrier zone from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean and elimination of any cases of screw-worm which penetrate the barrier. The barrier zone is located along the Mexico-United States border in order to take advantage of existing border control of the movement of livestock. The major portion of the zone is in Mexico, but it also includes the southern portions of each of the States of the United States which border on Mexico. This barrier will have to be operated indefinitely to prevent reestablishment of screw-worms in the United States. As long as the barrier remains in the present location, the Department is faced with a continuing high annual cost of operation. It is essential that we find means of reducing the cost and at the same time continue to provide protection against reestablishment of screw-worms in the United States.

One possibility for a substantial reduction in annual operating costs is movement of the barrier zone south to the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, the narrowest point of Mexico. At that location, the barrier would vary from 140 to 250 miles in width as compared to the present more than 2,000-mile barrier along the Mexico-United States border.

In order to move the barrier to southern Mexico, screw-worms will have to be eradicated in all areas north of the proposed new site.

An extensive field survey is presently in progress in the Republic of Mexico south of the existing artificial barrier zone to obtain information not presently available relating to (a) areas in Mexico favorable to screw-worm breeding; (b) natural population densities during different seasons of the year; (c) favorable resting areas and dispersal patterns; (d) varying husbandry practices in different areas of Mexico; and (e) economic losses in Mexico and on other factors that would be involved in moving the barrier southward. Mexico is cooperating in this survey.

Preliminary results of the survey indicate that eradication of screw-worms from Mexico may well prove technically feasible and that an effective barrier can be maintained across the narrowest part of Mexico at less cost than operation at the present location. After completion of the survey, providing that final survey data confirm that movement of the barrier is economically advantageous to the United States, a proposed program—with estimated cost—will be developed for consideration by the two Governments. The proposed amendment to Public Law 80-8 would not commit the Department to expenditure of any funds. It would merely provide standby authority under which the Department could cooperate with Mexico in a joint screw-worm eradication program in the event such a program is found to be feasible and desirable.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 20, 1966.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department welcomes the opportunity to comment on the provisions of S. 3325—a bill to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

The Department supports this legislation which is aimed at reducing the prevalence of screw-worm in both the United States and Mexico.

It is noted that pursuant to the act of February 28, 1947, such cooperation shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1947, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, or control, or to prevent or retard, foot-and-mouth disease [or rinderpest], *rinderpest or screw-worm* in Mexico where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States. In performing the operations or measures herein authorized, the Government of Mexico shall be responsible for the authority necessary to carry out such operations or measures on all lands and properties in Mexico and for such other facilities and means as in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture are necessary. The measure and character of cooperation carried out under this Act on the part of the United States and on the part of the Government of Mexico, including the expenditure or use of funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Arrangements for the cooperation authorized by this Act shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State. The authority contained in this Act is in addition to and not in substitution for the authority of existing law.

* * * * *

SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals.



Calendar No. 1312

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3325

[Report No. 1342]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 9, 1966

Mr. MONTROYA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 28, 1966

Reported by Mr. MONTROYA, with an amendment

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first section of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61
4 Stat. 7) is amended by striking out in the first sentence “or
5 rinderpest”, and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the
6 following: “rinderpest, or screw-worm”.

7 SEC. 2. ~~Section 2 of such Act is~~ *Such Act is further*
8 amended by adding a new section as follows:

9 “SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agri-

- 1 culture is further authorized to cooperate with other public
- 2 and private organizations and individuals.”

Calendar No. 1312

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3325

[Report No. 1342]

A BILL

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

By Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FANNIN,
Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KOCHER, Mr. MURPHY,
Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH

MAY 9, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 28, 1966

Reported with an amendment

June 29, 1966

10. INFORMATION. Rep. Findley commended Rep. Rumsfeld for his "effective work" in behalf of S. 1160, the freedom of information bill. pp. 13990-1
11. JOB CORPS. Rep. Quie inserted an editorial criticizing the Job Corps. p. 13996
12. FISH PROTEIN. Rep. Keith urged action on the bill to authorize construction and operation of pilot plants to produce fish protein concentrate. p. 13996
13. OPINION POLL. Rep. Albert inserted the results of a public opinion poll reflecting "a consensus of support for the President" in the handling of his job. pp. 14009-10
14. MANPOWER. Received a GAO report of review of selection and use of training authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. p. 14010
15. ADJOURNMENT. Agreed to H. Con. Res. 804, that when the House adjourns on Thursday, June 30, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 11, 1966. p. 13951

SENATE

16. MANPOWER. Passed with amendments S. 2974, to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expanding, modernizing, and improving operations under such Act at both State and Federal levels. pp. 14013, 14020-34
17. SCREW-WORM. Passed H. R. 14888, to authorize this Department to cooperate with the Mexican Government in screw-worm eradication in Mexico, with an amendment to substitute for its text the language of S. 3325, the companion bill. S. 3325 was indefinitely postponed. pp. 14048-49
18. SCHOOL LUNCH. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3467 with amendments, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children. p. D592
The District of Columbia Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1312, to authorize funds for the administration of school lunch programs in the D. C. p. D592
19. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10607, to provide reimbursement of additional moving expenses of Federal employees. p. D592
20. SURPLUS PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2610, to grant Federal and State agencies priorities for obtaining surplus Government property prior to its sale. p. D592
21. GRAIN STANDARDS. Received from this department a proposed bill to provide for U. S. standards and a uniform national inspection system for grain; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 14035
22. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire commended and discussed National Milk Producers' Federation testimony urging separate school milk and school lunch programs. p. 14064

23. TARIFF. Agreed to S. Con. Res. 100, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain agreements which would necessitate modification of duties or other import restrictions. pp. 14042-8
24. PESTICIDES. Sen. Ribicoff criticized as a "step backward" reported plans for disbanding the special unit of the Public Health Service dealing with pesticides. p. 14074
25. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Moss urged U. S.-Canadian cooperation on water resource development and use and inserted two speeches (one his own) on the subject. pp. 14074-7
26. FISH PROTEIN. Sen. Pell spoke in favor of recently passed S. 2720, authorizing a demonstration program for producing fish protein concentrate, and inserted several articles on the subject. pp. 14082-7
27. RESEARCH. Sen. Fong commended the formation of the National Oceanography Association as a welcome development in the growth of marine science and technology. pp. 14058-9
28. LIBRARIES. Sen. Tower lauded the recent passage of H. R. 14050, to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act. p. 14060
29. HOUSING. Sen. Hart discussed increasing "difficulties" in the relocation of families, individuals, and businesses displaced by Federal or Federally assisted programs and inserted two articles on the subject. pp. 14069-71

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

30. FARM PRICES. Rep. Gross inserted an agricultural analyst's letter to him which presents the "relationship between the underpayment to American agriculture and the tremendous expansion of public and private debt." pp. A3484-5
31. OPINION POLLS. Reps. Latta and Griffiths inserted the results of opinion polls, including items of interest to this Department. pp. A3491, A3496
32. MILK MARKETING. Rep. Green, Pa., inserted an article, "Federal Controls At A Snail's Pace", critical of the alleged delay by this Department in amending certain milk marketing orders. pp. A3491-2
33. POVERTY. Rep. Brademas inserted Sargent Shriver's testimony on this program. pp. A3509-11
Extension of remarks of Rep. Quie criticizing the poverty program and inserting an article. pp. A3519-20
34. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Gallagher stating that "the true value of economic aid is an investment in the people who are willing to help themselves", and inserting David Bell's address recounting foreign aid efforts. pp. A3516-9

BILLS INTRODUCED

35. PERSONNEL. H. R. 16051 by Rep. Fulton of Tenn., to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors,

as a clear and deliberate intention on the part of the executive branch to depart from this proven procedure. In introducing this resolution, it was sincerely hoped that this great precedent in our Nation's trade policy could be preserved.

Let me emphasize that Senate Concurrent Resolution 100 does not raise a constitutional issue. Nor is it a false issue. It seeks merely to redefine what has been accepted as our national trade policy since 1934. There is not one single word or phrase contained in the resolution that attempts to deny the President his constitutionally assigned authority. It actually strengthens and makes more viable his constitutional authority. It asks only for a rededication to the "hand-in-hand" policy of congressional and Executive cooperation in trade matters. In this sense it is more aptly described as an issue of good faith.

I would point out that in passing the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Congress delegated to the executive branch the broadest authority ever delegated for tariff reductions.

If the executive branch is determined to free itself of the long-standing and time-honored commitment to receive prior approval from Congress before acting in the trade field, then it is idle for the Congress to go through the empty gesturing of deliberating long and conscientiously on legislative grants such as the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Either we openly and deliberately abandon this course, or insist on future compliance by the executive.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 100 determines upon the latter course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1341), explaining the purposes of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that in the conduct of or in connection with negotiations to carry out the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, no agreement or other arrangement which would necessitate the modification of any duty or other import restriction applicable under the laws of the United States should be entered into except in accordance with legislative authority delegated by the Congress prior to the entering into of such agreement or arrangement.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Background.—Until 1934, delegated authority to cut U.S. tariffs on imported articles was limited to determinations under the so-called flexible tariff provision which permitted tariff charges based upon comparative costs of production in order to equalize the costs of production here and abroad. With this exception ratemaking was primarily a function of Congress. Beginning in that year, however, this Nation embarked upon a new course in foreign trade policy. For the first time Congress delegated broad tariff-cutting authority to the President empowering him to offer reductions in U.S. tariffs on articles imported from abroad in return for concessions from foreign countries reducing barriers to U.S. exports. In 1945, 1955, and 1958, Congress delegated authority to the President to cut our tariff rates by additional amounts.

Each of these grants of authority provided for tariff reductions to apply equally to products of any nation. Under this delegated authority, articles coming from any country would be treated no less favorably than those from another country that did not discriminate against our commerce. Most-favored-nation treatment since the early 1950's has not been accorded products of Communist countries, and such products remain subject to the higher statutory rates of duty without regard to our tariff concessions.

This reciprocal trade policy has worked well within the framework of a constitutional system of checks and balances which vests in Congress the sole authority to change tariffs and confers on the President the sole authority over international negotiations. In this area where neither Congress nor the President has sufficient power to act independently of the other, the two branches since 1934 have joined their strengths to overcome their weaknesses. Thus, Congress delegated tariff-cutting authority in advance and the President entered into reciprocal trade agreements providing for tariff reductions pursuant to that authority. Historically, it has not been the practice under our trade policy to first enter into a tariff-cutting agreement and then seek its implementation.

Trade Expansion Act of 1962.—Because of the success of the reciprocal trade policy and because the existing tariff cutting authority had been exhausted, Congress approved the continuation of this policy in the bold new provisions enacted in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It not only continued the authority for the President to reduce our tariffs in return for concessions from foreign nations, but also for the first time authorized the complete elimination of some duties. Another important innovation in U.S. trade policy made by that act was the concept of adjustment assistance for workers and firms. This assistance, though still unused, was designed to relieve distressed workers and firms hard hit by import competition resulting from tariff concessions extended under authority delegated by Congress.

The basic negotiating authority under the Trade Expansion Act empowers the President to proclaim such modification or continuance of any existing duty or other import restriction as he deems appropriate to carry out any trade agreement entered into under that act, except that he may not cut any rate of duty to a rate below 50 percent of the rate existing on July 1, 1962. The President is further empowered to negotiate the complete elimination of duties where the rate in question is not more than 5 percent ad valorem or its equivalent, or where more than 80 percent of the world export value of an article is accounted for by the United States and the countries of the European Economic Community. Similarly, he may eliminate duties on certain agricultural commodities and on tropical commodities.

Authority to enter into trade agreements under the Trade Expansion Act expires June 30, 1967.

Reasons for the resolution.—The Committee on Finance has been pleased with the operation over the years of Congress partnership with the President in foreign trade matters. Long experience convinces us that arming the President in advance with tariff-cutting authority is the most effective means of achieving fair and equitable expansion of trade in the free world. Under this historical procedure, Congress, which is constitutionally vested with sole power to lay duties (art. 1, sec. 8), may weigh the merits of tariff reductions and the extent of contemplated concessions uninhibited by the international implications of a failure to implement obediently a trade agreement already negotiated by the President. It may similarly consider the circumstances under which adjustment assistance is appropriate.

The Committee on Finance has been disturbed over reports that the current Kennedy round of tariff negotiations may be broadened to include U.S. offers of concessions with respect to matters for which there is no existing delegated authority. In the committee's view, this would violate the principles which have made our reciprocal trade program so successful for more than three decades.

It has been reported that one area in which our negotiators may offer concessions concerns the American selling price method of valuation, which is part of the tariff determination process with respect to canned clams, and certain knit gloves, and more importantly, rubber-soled footwear (principally of the sneaker type) and benzenoid chemicals, the so-called coal tar products. Our negotiators concede that no delegation of authority exists, either under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 or any other existing legislation, to modify the American selling price system pursuant to a trade agreement.

Another area may involve the treatment of "dumped" goods by the country in which the dumping occurs. This problem concerns unfair trade practices in a domestic economy and it is difficult for us to understand why Congress should be bypassed at the crucial policymaking stages, and permitted to participate only after policy has been frozen in an international trade agreement.

Congress has been no less forward-looking than the executive branch in trade matters and any action by our negotiators which tends to subordinate and degrade the important congressional role should not be condoned and will be resisted. The committee recognizes that our Constitution empowers the President alone to enter into international agreements and treaties. We do not question the legality of an agreement involving a trade matter for which no prior authority has been delegated. Our concern is that the experience gained over more than 30 years of a working partnership between the Congress and the Chief Executive may be set aside. It is this concern that moves us to protect the congressional role. We hope our negotiators will understand the great wisdom of confining their activities to those areas in which they have been authorized by Congress to proceed.

SUMMARY

For the reasons stated above, the Committee on Finance reports this resolution to express the sense of Congress that our trade negotiators in Geneva should not enter into any agreement or other arrangement which would require the modification of a U.S. duty or other import restriction except in accordance with clear legislative authority delegated by Congress prior to the negotiation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 100). [Putting the question.]

Mr. JAVITS. I vote "No."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" have it.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 100) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 100

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, in the conduct of or in connection with negotiations to carry out the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, no agreement or other arrangement which would necessitate the modification of any duty or other import restriction applicable under the laws of the United States should be entered into except in accordance with legislative authority delegated by the Congress prior to the entering into of such agreement or arrangement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am opposed. I say "No."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is so recorded.

COOPERATION RELATING TO SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN MEXICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3325) to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after "Sec. 2.", to strike out "Section 2 of such Act is" and insert "Such Act is further"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 3325

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by striking out in the first sentence "or rinderpest", and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "rinderpest, or screw-worm".

SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals."

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, it is my privilege today to speak briefly in support of S. 3325, a bill which will permit this country to join with Mexico in a cooperative program for the control of screw-worms.

This bill, which I introduced on May 9, was reported out unanimously by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry yesterday after receiving careful consideration and study. One clarifying amendment was made, but did not change the substance of the bill in any way.

S. 3325 will amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, under which the Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to undertake a cooperative program with Mexico for the elimination of foot-and-mouth disease. This highly successful control program was carried out in Mexico, in cooperation with the Mexican Government, so that today foot-and-mouth disease no longer threatens either the U.S. cattle industry or the Mexican cattle industry.

S. 3325 will permit the Department of Agriculture to utilize this valuable precedent and valuable experience in carrying out a similar international control program against screw-worm.

Screw-worm is a serious cattle pest which is endemic in much of Mexico. Until recently, it was also a serious problem in the Southeastern and the Southwestern United States.

Department of Agriculture specialists have devised an effective method of con-

trol which involves the installation and maintenance of "barriers" of sterile screw-worm flies.

Once the pest is eliminated, as in the Southeastern States in 1960 and the Southwestern States including New Mexico by 1964, it can be kept out of a region so long as this barrier is maintained.

At present, the United States is maintaining such a barrier along the 2,000 mile border that we share with Mexico at an annual combined Federal-State cost estimated at \$5.2 million.

The same protection could be obtained at far less cost by moving this barrier southward to the narrow waist of central Mexico. The barrier there would be only 150 to 200 miles long, and would be much easier to maintain as well as less expensive to maintain.

At present, the Department of Agriculture lacks the authority for a cooperative eradication program in Mexico. S. 3325 will provide that authority.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate's favorable consideration of S. 3325.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Agriculture Committee reported S. 3325, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with Mexico in a screw-worm eradication program in that country. This legislation, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] is vital to the livestock producers of this country. I am honored to be a cosponsor.

In the past, livestock producers in the southern half of the United States suffered an annual loss of \$100 million due to the destructive screw-worm. With new scientific methods, eradication of native screw-worm populations has been accomplished in the Southeast and Southwest States, and most recently in Arizona and California. A barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean along the Mexican border, preventing the entry of screw-worms from Mexico into areas of the United States which have been freed from this pest.

Near Mission, Tex., production of sterile screw-worm flies has been perfected to the point that every operation is at least partially automated, permitting an output of more than 150 million flies per week. At Texas A. & M. University research is being conducted on the technical feasibility and economic practicality of applying electronic data processing to screw-worm eradication. By charting patterns of fly distribution and tracing the routes the insects would follow in moving outward from the peaks of concentration, the system could predict future outbreaks and employ preventive measures to control probable danger areas. It is estimated that for every dollar spent on the eradication program the livestock industry has saved \$15.

The bill before us now would greatly reduce the cost of this program while insuring the security of our own animals. At the present time 1,850 miles of barrier are maintained to halt the introduction of Mexican screw-worms into the United States. A survey is being conducted in Mexico to study eradication of the screw-worm there. Indications are

that an effective barrier could be maintained across the narrow part of Mexico, the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, for a fraction of the expense of the existing barrier. Coordination and cooperation between Mexico and the United States is essential to the success of this program.

S. 3325 amends the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Mexican Government in screw-worm eradication. An open-ended authorization is provided; funds must be appropriated by Congress through the regular appropriations process.

I strongly urge passage of this bill to protect the livestock industry of this country by extending southward the barrier zone of sterile screw-worm flies. The expense of the existing program will be reduced while the scope of protection is increased. I hope my fellow Senators will join in passing S. 3325 as reported.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1342), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3325 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Mexican Government in screw-worm eradication in Mexico. Currently the United States is assuming the total burden of conducting an eradication program along our entire border with Mexico which runs some 2,000 miles. A successful eradication program in Mexico could eventually mean the establishment of a much shorter and, therefore, less costly barrier across Mexico, probably at the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

The legislation is further explained in the attached favorable report from the Department of Agriculture. Also attached is the report from the Department of State recommending enactment of the bill. A companion bill, H.R. 14888, passed the House June 6, 1966. The committee amendment is technical.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Subsequently, the Senate took the following action:

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of a companion bill, H.R. 14888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 14888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14888) to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and that the text of S. 3325, the bill passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time, and passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill, S. 3325, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, this request was made by the Senate staff to clear up an inadvertent error, which has now been corrected.

TO INCREASE THE AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINUING WORK IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1308, Senate 3186. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3186) to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments to the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2999) to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (Act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)).

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7423) to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 1535. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; and

H.R. 2035. An act to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in star route contract prices.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 804. Concurrent resolution providing that when the House adjourns on June 30, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, July 11, 1966; and

H. Con. Res. 805. Concurrent resolution providing that the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed and found truly enrolled.

DEDICATION OF THE ESTES KEFAUVER MEMORIAL LIBRARY—REMARKS BY SENATOR JACKSON, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass] on the dedication of the Estes Kefauver Memorial Library, and the remarks made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BASS

The Estes Kefauver Memorial Library, in honor of the distinguished Senator, was dedicated last Saturday, June 25, 1966, in ceremonies at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville at which my good friend and our distinguished colleague Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington delivered the major address. Senator JACKSON, a close personal friend of the late Senator Kefauver, well expressed the feelings of devotion that I, many of my fellow Tennesseans, and many throughout the nation feel toward this remarkable man. As I was bedridden by an inoperable case of the flu, my wife, Avanelle, was kind enough to represent me at the dedication ceremonies and to express at that time our love and admiration for Senator Kefauver. I would like to take this further opportunity to recognize the outstanding contribution that he has made to the people of Tennessee and the nation alike.

It is difficult to imagine a more fitting tribute to his achievements than the Estes Kefauver Memorial Library which will house the documents that chronicle his life. It will serve as a permanent, vital monument to a great man. The spectacular success of the fund-raising campaign for the Estes Kefauver Memorial Foundation is testimony itself to the high regard in which Senator Kefauver is held throughout the nation. In less than three years the Foundation has raised more than \$925,000, exceeding its goal by more than \$150,000. Some \$400,000 of these funds will be used as an endowment to provide Estes Kefauver Scholarships at the University of Tennessee. Another endowment of \$105,000 has been created in his name at Wilberforce University, the oldest Negro university in Ohio, and a Kefauver scholarship fund of \$5,000 has been established at Knoxville College. In addition, an Estes Kefauver lecture series has been

founded at Southwestern University in Memphis to offer annually programs about the federation of democracies into a Union of the Free. Edward Meeman, editor emeritus of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, has donated \$50,000 to provide an annual award to promote the cause of Atlantic Union, a cause that Senator Kefauver himself consistently championed.

In his address Senator JACKSON discussed the Atlantic Community, an expression often used to refer to the Atlantic Union, and he commended Kefauver for his firm commitment to the Union. He also paid homage to the courage and statesmanship which characterized Senator Kefauver's career.

REMARKS BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ESTES KEFAUVER MEMORIAL LIBRARY, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, JUNE 25, 1966

I am honored to be a participant in this dedication in memory of a distinguished son of Tennessee, an outstanding statesman of our country, and my long-time close personal friend, Senator Estes Kefauver. I am pleased that Nancy Kefauver and her wonderful children, Diane, Gail, Linda, and David are with us, as well as his faithful and loyal sisters, Nancy Fooshee and Nora Kefauver.

I well remember Monday, August 12, 1963, the day set aside by Estes Kefauver's colleagues in the House and Senate to pay their tributes to a departed friend. One man after another rose to speak of his courage, his integrity, his friendliness, the tirelessness of his service. Two phrases came to many minds that day as we recalled his work among us: He was a man—and he was a man of the people.

Estes was a man—independent, fearless, sometimes a loner, following his own lights, a pioneer in a coonskin cap blazing a path to a better life through the trackless wilderness of Washington. On more than one occasion, when the time came to cast his vote on a controversial issue, Estes would say: "Well, here goes. I'm not sure the folks in Tennessee will be send me back, for this isn't popular in my country, but it's the right thing to do, and I'm going to vote for it."

When we pay tribute to Estes, therefore, we are also paying tribute to the people of his beloved Tennessee, who did send him back, over and over again. They knew he was a man, they respected him for it, and they preferred a man who knew his own mind to one who would try to be all things to all men.

Estes was also a man of the people—deeply conscious of the public interest and determined to use the great powers of the Federal Government to advance the welfare of the people. It brought him into conflict again and again with the "special interests"; you might say that Estes made himself the spokesman of the special interests of the people.

You here in Tennessee knew it, and many other Americans intuitively recognized it. Estes won 14 of the 17 primaries he entered in his campaign for his party's Presidential nomination in 1952—a remarkable tribute to a man who had not endeared himself to the political pros in his own party.

It is a good thing you are doing here to create working memorials to a working man. The collection of his papers is of historical importance, and provides rich materials for scholarly research into an important period of our national life.

There is nothing that would please Estes more than the knowledge that young men will be helped to prepare themselves for useful careers by scholarships in his name.

In a time when young men and women in this great university, as elsewhere around the country, face what it is fashionable to call "a crisis of identity," I think it is a good thing to hold Estes before them as a man worth emulating. That is what you accom-

plish by the Estes Kefauver Human Dignity and Free Economy Awards.

Many of you and probably most of other Americans usually think of Estes in terms of domestic problems, issues, and concerns, such as his support of TVA and public power, his battles with trusts and monopolies, his fight against organized crime, and his firm stand for progress in the field of civil rights.

On this occasion, however, I want to recall his persistent and vigorous support of co-operation among the free nations as the surest road to a peaceful world. As Estes said in July 1962:

"Two 'hot' wars and the 'cold' one . . . have sharpened our awareness of our common roots, our common interests, our common ideals, and our common enemy. Out of this awareness has come concerted action, both military and economic; 'united or perish' has been our watchword. We united in the execution of the Marshall Plan . . . in NATO . . . in the . . . Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development . . . Some of these things we have done and are doing together because of the Soviet threat. But they are things that, regardless of the Soviet threat, we should do together because they are right."

Estes was in the forefront in his support of the Marshall Plan, economic cooperation, and the reduction of trade barriers—and in his support of realistic programs to strengthen and develop the Atlantic Community.

The first task of the Atlantic Alliance is to insure the security of its members by linking their talents and resources in such a way that any potential aggressor cannot hope to take on one at a time. NATO has provided this vital insurance for seventeen years and will continue to do so.

But an alliance can also serve to advance some of the other positive goals of its members. The strength and unity of the Atlantic area so carefully developed over the years is a major factor in creating the necessary political conditions for moving toward settlement of the troubling issues left over from World War II.

Estes always stressed the necessity of political solidarity among the western allies in order to move toward the kind of world we all seek. He was never a worshipper of the status quo anywhere. He would have welcomed the current efforts of the Fourteen allies to surmount the crisis precipitated by De Gaulle's eviction notice, to streamline the alliance and to make better use of its great potential in dealing with the outstanding issues of the day.

The North Atlantic Alliance, of course, has unfinished business—which is to reach a genuine, stable European settlement with the Soviet Union—to create conditions in which people can speak meaningfully of Europe instead of Western Europe and Eastern Europe, and to build a Europe which will strengthen the prospects for world peace and contribute to peaceful progress in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Fourteen allies believe that Western unity and strength are the foundation stones of a genuine settlement. President de Gaulle apparently does not.

A genuine settlement will involve, among other things, a reduction of Soviet forces in Eastern Europe and their return to the Soviet Union. The Fourteen allies believe that the Soviet rulers are more likely to consider favorably such a move if the West remains strong than if Western power and resolve diminish. The Fourteen do not understand how they can improve their bargaining by weakening it.

There is the issue—and it is one on which we in the United States need to be clear. Some Americans are already asking why we should keep American boys in Europe if France is not going to play her full part in the defense of Western Europe. The answer is that it would be folly to unilaterally cut

our forces in Europe and throw away the bargaining position we have worked long and hard to build. We should not cut our combat capability in Europe without corresponding concessions from the Soviet Union—especially so when the concession we ask are but contributions to a peaceful future for all of Europe, East and West. We could look forward to the reduction and redeployment of U.S. and NATO forces if the Soviets make effective arrangements for an equivalent reduction and redeployment of their forces.

The strength and progress of the Atlantic Community have been the product of allied cooperation, and cooperation has been the product of a readiness to subordinate lesser national interests to the overriding national interest in a security obtainable only by joint action with allies.

The processes of give-and-take and mutual accommodation are at the heart of joint ventures. Estes Kefauver knew this very well. He did vital work in the service of the Atlantic nations as a prime mover and leading participant in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. Estes was at his very best in the give-and-take with allied leaders, the frank talk and the listening, necessary to effective collaboration and action.

Estes Kefauver, like all statesmen, knew that the course of politics is not always straight and smooth. One suffers reverses and setbacks. He also knew the importance of persistence when one is on the right road.

A main purpose of the Estes Kefauver Memorial Foundation is to perpetuate the ideals Estes worked for during his long but all-too-short public career. No ideal was more important to him than the unity of free men on which our hopes for peace and progress depend. Nothing will do greater honor to his memory than to keep that ideal clearly before us as a light to guide by when the going gets rough.

PRESS REACTION TO TITLE IV

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as Congress continues to deliberate title IV of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, the people and the press in the country have become more aroused. My mail shows that the very great majority of the American people do not want to see their rights to sell or rent their property destroyed by act of Congress.

One of the more eloquent and cogent editorials on this subject was contained in the Charlotte News of Friday, June 17, 1966. This editorial is the embodiment of the best tradition in objective and scholarly editorial writing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, together with excerpts from title IV quoted by the writer, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charlotte News, June 17, 1966]

TITLE IV MUST GO

It is a sad truth that the worst law often issues from noble impulses. If it is a noble impulse to wish to provide a broader range of opportunity in housing for Americans who have been disadvantaged because of their race, that does relieve laws to this end of the need to be rational and to work good for all.

The salient features of Title IV—the so-called Open Housing title—of the administration's civil rights bill—are excerpted in the box accompanying this editorial. It is easy enough to determine what the bill sets out to accomplish. It sets out to banish race,

color, or creed as considerations in the rental or sale of private property. It sets out to force the landlord, real estate agent, or homeowner under the law to treat Negroes and whites identically.

And right away, at its central purpose, it is in trouble. For it tempts the assumption that it simply extends to the Negro rights previously held by whites. Nothing could be further from the truth. A homeowner's right to rent to one man for no better reason than that he has black hair or to refuse to rent to another for no better reason than that he has red hair is deeply rooted in the law. So liberal a man as Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas is one authority out of many on this point. He wrote, in *Lombard v. Louisiana*: "For the Bill of Rights, as applied to the States through the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, casts its weight on the side of the privacy of homes. A private person has no standing to obtain even limited access. The principle that a man's home is his castle is basic to our system of jurisprudence."

In other words, the private individual, whatever his color, never has had rights involving such access to private property. Suddenly, now, it is proposed that he does indeed have such rights, and that the property owner's rights must bow to them.

It is difficult to grasp the full meaning of such an assertion. Nothing like it resides in the record of constitutional interpretation, which insists upon the basic distinction between private and public property. The Supreme Court in *Shelley v. Kramer* put it very well: "The principle has become firmly embedded in our constitutional law that the action inhibited by the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the State." *That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however, discriminatory or wrongful.*

We have emphasized this last phrase because it is basic to understand the issue here and in so many other areas of disputed interpretation of the Constitution. The Constitution is not a document intended to right all wrongs. It is a legal framework within which government and the individual can subsist in a meaningful but not coercive relationship with each other. Much of the good that Americans see to do can be done only by persuasion, not by coercion, and certainly not by passing new and more encompassing law.

Indeed, much ill can be done in the name of good and by exactly such means. It's possible to offer one simple example of the kind of wrong that could ensue from passage of Title IV.

Let's suppose that a man decides to offer his house for sale and advertises it. A prospective buyer looks at the house and makes an offer. The homeowner takes it under consideration but in time decides, for one reason or another, to remain in the house himself and not to sell. He so informs the prospective buyer.

It is entirely possible that if the prospective buyer happened to be a Negro that the homeowner would find himself haled into court and forced to prove that his decision not to sell was not based on the prospective buyer's race, color, or creed. That might be hard to prove. In the end, the homeowner might find himself judged guilty of discrimination, subject to a stiff fine.

All of this goes, as we have noted, without consideration of the rights of the homeowners, well established in constitutional interpretation. The basic right not to be deprived of liberty or property without due process of law—the only right expressly mentioned in both the 14th Amendment and the Bill of Rights—would be sacrificed by Title IV of a new, so-called right of "open occupancy."

Can such a law be constitutional? We do not believe it, if the Constitution still has

July 12, 1966

10. RECREATION. Sen. Nelson spoke in favor of the bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation. pp. 14539-40
11. STATION TRANSFERS. Sen. Tower commended passage of legislation to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of Government employees. p. 14540
12. EDUCATION. Sen. Dominick commended and inserted a speech, "Aiding Higher Education Through Income Tax Credits for Tuitions and Gifts." pp. 14556-61
13. LIVESTOCK. Sen. Tower inserted a resolution favoring an expansion of facilities of the Packers and Stockyards Division of this Department. p. 14542
14. PARITY PRICES. Sen. Church commended and inserted an article praising the role of Sen. McGovern in drafting and sponsoring recently passed S. Con. Res. 88, relative to parity prices for agricultural commodities. pp. 14540-1

HOUSE

15. SCREW-WORM. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 14888, to authorize this Department to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 14625
16. PERSONNEL; PAY. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 14122, the proposed Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1966. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 14637-43, 14705
17. FOREIGN AID. Began debate on H. R. 15730, the foreign aid authorization bill. pp. 14644-64, 14695
18. LANDS. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee consideration, S. 1674, amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources (including certain Forest Service lands); p. D611
19. WATER AND AIR POLLUTION. Rep. Clarence J. Brown, Jr., spoke in support of his bill, H. R. 16078, to allow an incentive tax credit for the cost of construction of facilities for the control of water and air pollution. p. 14625
20. RECLAMATION. Rep. Saylor commended and inserted an article opposing the proposed construction of Central Arizona project dams on the Colorado River. p. 14626
21. FOOD IRRADIATION. Reps. Price and Bates praised the possible long-range benefits of food irradiation and urged additional research and development in this area. pp. 14668-70
22. TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING. Rep. Arends stated that there is "some merit" in the truth-in-packaging bill but that he does not believe "that the Secretary of Commerce should have the authority to compel uniformity in packaging," and inserted an article on the subject. pp. 14671-2
23. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Rep. Younger inserted a speech, "Federal Grants and the Decline of the Federal System." pp. 14672-6

24. WAR ON POVERTY. Rep. Gibbons commended the Jobs Corps and other aspects of the war on poverty and inserted some articles on the subject. pp. 14703-5
25. DEMONSTRATION CITIES. Rep. Hansen, Iowa, inserted an American Institute of Architects resolution favoring the demonstration cities program as included in H. R. 15890, the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966. p. 14701

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

26. RECREATION. Sen. Randolph inserted Sen. Byrd's article describing the beauty of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. p. A3605
27. WORLD HUNGER. Rep. Hanna inserted an article, "World Hunger: Enemy of Prosperity." pp. A3624-7
28. PERSONNEL. Rep. Gubser inserted a speech, "What Price Competence?", discussing the problem of attracting the best possible people into Government service. pp. A3633-4
29. FARMERS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Callan commending and inserting an article, "The American Farmer--God Bless Him." p. A3637
30. WATERSHEDS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bandstra expressing his "deep concern over the Bureau of the Budget's recently adopted policy with regard to new projects under the U. S. Soil Conservation Service watershed program." p. A3641
31. FOREIGN AID; WHEAT. Speech in the House by Rep. Ashbrook questioning the President's proposal to give India wheat, and inserting an article, "India: Too Poor To Be Effective--Too Big To Be Ignored." pp. A3646-9

BILLS INTRODUCED

32. LOANS. S. 3606 by Sen. Talmadge, to provide assistance to first processors of agricultural commodities who have suffered substantial losses because of the economic impact of commodity programs of the Department of Agriculture; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.
33. PESTICIDES. S. 3608 by Sen. Nelson, to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as D.D.T.; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author pp. 14517-526
34. FISH PROTEIN. H. R. 16145 by Rep. Hanna and H. R. 16173 by Rep. Tupper, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Remarks of Rep. Hanna, pp. 14700-1
35. EDUCATION. H. R. 16142 by Rep. Ford, to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to the administration of certain federally operated schools; to Education and Labor Committee.

which pertain to the anniversary of the DAV.

If any Member has any objections to the reprint, it is requested that he contact either my office or Mr. Raymond Noyes, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk. This statement is being made in order to comply with the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing for the reprinting of extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PRECEDENT IS ESTABLISHED FOR SAVINGS IN MILITARY EXPENSES

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the claim of Secretary of Defense McNamara yesterday that he has saved this country \$4½ billion, and with tongue in cheek, I want to read a publicity release that was prepared by a few newsmen who will remain unidentified. The release is dated July 1, 1871. It is headed "Large Savings Achieved by Field Commander in West." It reads as follows:

[A news release of the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C., No. 571-71, July 1, 1871]

LARGE SAVINGS ACHIEVED BY FIELD COMMANDER IN WEST

Defense officials have lauded Gen. George Custer, commander of the 7th Cavalry, for his decision to save money by not taking the new Gatling guns into the field during his annual campaign in the Dakota Territories against the Blackfeet and Sioux.

Custer's decision is expected to save \$1,760 in feed for horses to pull the wheeled Gatlings as well as \$48.50 in additional maintenance if the new and delicate weapons were to be exposed to dust and field conditions.

RESOLUTION REQUIRING REPAYMENT OF WAR DEBTS BY FRANCE

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting a concurrent resolution which provides that the President should take such steps as may be necessary in order to require the Republic of France to make full and prompt settlement of World War I and other debts, owed to the United States. France is obligated to the United States on these debts in the amount of \$6,580,932,495.57. No payments have been made since 1932. U.S. loans and military and economic aid to France, since World War II, have amounted to well over \$7,500 million. If the United States is to maintain her position as the economic leader and stabilizer of the world, we cannot afford to operate on such a nonbusinesslike basis.

Actions and policies of the Republic of France, which are set forth in the resolution, clearly point out that France does not currently intend to settle these debts. One such action is the order that military facilities constructed by the United States for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization be removed from French soil. These facilities can be duplicated elsewhere only at very high cost.

Another example, is the apparent intention of France to undermine the dollar. Since January 1962, she has withdrawn \$2,369 million in gold from the United States. This is predicated on her "legal right" to do so, under a 1932 law, which took our own people off the gold standard, but allowed nations and bankers outside the United States to continue to demand gold.

Our World War II "moratorium pro tempore" on France's repayment schedule of World War I debts, as a friendly ally was also a factor.

When a nation we have helped to defend and rebuild does not see fit to honor and resume her long-term obligations to us, even in times of economic growth and stability, it seems readily apparent that we should take necessary action to insure full and prompt settlement with respect to past due accounts.

SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN MEXICO

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14888) to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the first section of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by striking out in the first sentence 'or rinderpest', and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'rinderpest, or screw-worm'."

SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, will the gentleman from Texas please explain for the benefit of the House the changes that were made in the House version by the Senate?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. In the first place, the Senate struck out the word "or" and inserted a comma in lieu. In the second place, the Senate struck out the word "Section" and used the abbreviation "Sec." In the third place, the Senate divided our section 2 into two sections, creating a new section. That is all there is to it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Am I correct in understanding that the ranking Member on the minority side has cleared these changes with the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further; yes, he has

and has discussed it with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO ALLOW AN INCENTIVE TAX CREDIT FOR COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES FOR THE CONTROL OF WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

(Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 I introduced a measure, H.R. 16078, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years.

Pollution of our air and water resources is continuing at an alarming rate. Through cooperation of Federal, State, and local government bodies with private business and industrial enterprise, air and water pollution control facilities can be constructed to prevent further pollution of these resources.

The money expended by private enterprise for the construction of these costly facilities is an investment in non-productive facilities, primarily in the public interest, requiring high, non-productive operating costs which will be continuing charges against future earnings.

The most efficient way to encourage this kind of investment would seem to be by means of tax credit, rather than Federal grant. The necessary legislation to require pollution abatement facilities to meet local, State, and Federal standards is already on the books, and many industries have indicated their eagerness to tackle this problem.

A tax credit arrangement would enable them to do so promptly without having to wait for the availability of funds from Government grants. Such an arrangement would also eliminate costly administrative redtape, implicit in any Federal grant program.

I feel there is a very definite need for legislation of this nature, and it is my hope that hearings can be held on H.R. 16078 before Congress adjourns.

ARMED FORCES AIR TRANSPORTATION SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I, like many other Members of the House, was caught by the airline strike last Saturday. I was in Colorado Springs. I called the Air Force to see if they might have a plane going back to Washington, which they said they did. But I was not eligible to ride on it. If I was an active reserve officer in any branch of the armed services, I could ride on it.

I am a former officer having spent 5 years in the navy in World War II, but I am not a member of the Active Reserve so I was not given permission to ride on that airplane. I had to bother my committee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] at his home in Texas who, in turn, called some general in the Pentagon and they did get permission for me to get on this plane.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Members of Congress should have the right to travel on military air transports on a space available basis just as members of the Reserve in the various branches of our armed services. I know that there have been abuses of congressional junkets, but it seems to me that we, the 535 Members of the Congress should have the privilege of riding on military transport facilities on a space available basis if we have a legitimate need for transportation.

NATIONAL WONDER: PERMIT DESTRUCTION OF GRAND CANYON WHILE SPENDING U.S. DOLLARS TO PRESERVE ANCIENT RUINS IN EGYPT?

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as more newspapermen become aware of the move to destroy the natural state of the Grand Canyon, protests are growing around the Nation.

As early as May 17, "The Daily Pantagraph," Bloomington, Ill., whose president and publisher is Mr. Loring Merwin, published a stirring editorial that promoters of Marble and Bridge Canyon Dams would find impossible to answer. It requires no further comment. I ask that it appear herewith in the RECORD for your assiduous perusal:

[From the Daily Pantagraph, May 17, 1966]

WHY RUIN NATIONAL WONDER?

The United States is spending millions of dollars on a project to preserve some of the ancient architecture and ruins which would otherwise be inundated with the completion of the Aswan Dam in Egypt.

It is a paradox that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and interested groups are pressing so hard to get a bill through Congress calling for construction of two dams on the Colorado River which would destroy much of the natural beauty of the Grand Canyon.

One of these, the Bridge Canyon Dam, would create a reservoir nearly 100 miles long flooding the full length of the Grand Canyon National Monument and 13 miles into the Grand Canyon.

The other, Marble Gorge Dam, upstream from the Grand Canyon National Park, would flood some of the most beautiful areas of the Grand Canyon. It also would make possible another project, the Kanab Diverston Project, which would leave the river through much of the park a dry ditch.

All this is proposed in the name of the Central Arizona Project devised to provide water for dry areas. Actually the dams are proposed primarily for the creation of electricity which, in turn, would be sold to justify other phases of the water project.

Richard C. Bradley of Colorado University and many other opponents of these dams contend that the proposed generating facilities at these dams would not be economically feasible for long because of rapid development of other sources of fuel for producing electricity.

They also are pressing for legislation to protect the Grand Canyon area from further encroachment. The Bureau of the Budget has recommended deferment of at least Bridge Canyon Dam pending additional study. This gives conservationists some time to act.

We urge citizens to protest this planned destruction of one of the world's natural wonders by writing their Congressmen.

Other means to provide water and to generate electricity must and can be found.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 158]

Abbutt	Hansen, Wash.	Reid, N.Y.
Bandstra	Harsha	Resnick
Baring	Harvey, Mich.	Rivers, Alaska
Bell	Helstoski	Robison
Callaway	Herlong	St Germain
Celler	Jennings	Scheuer
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Schmidhauser
Colmer	Keogh	Scott
Conable	King, N.Y.	Senner
Conyers	Laird	Sickles
Corman	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	McCarthy	Steed
Delaney	McFall	Stephens
Downing	Martin, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, La.	Mathias	Thompson, N.J.
Ellsworth	Matsunaga	Toil
Everett	Mills	Trimble
Ewins, Tenn.	Mink	Tuck
Farnsley	Moore	Tunney
Farnum	Morris	Tuten
Findley	Morse	Ullman
Flynt	Murray	Van Deerlin
Fulton, Tenn.	O'Hara, Mich.	Walker, Miss.
Green, Oreg.	O'Konski	Whitten
Hagen, Calif.	O'Neal, Ga.	Willis
Hanna	Pool	Wright
Hansen, Idaho	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—MILITARY PAY INCREASE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2950) "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test,

and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk began the reading of the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 30, 1966.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (during the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the conference report has been printed, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the statement on the part of the managers of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] 30 minutes and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I will give the Members of the House as accurately as I can exactly what happened in the conference on the bill, S. 2950.

We had \$20 million for television and communications aircraft for Saigon. The conferees agreed on \$12 million.

We had \$51.2 million for aeromedical evacuation airplanes. The conferees agreed on \$25 million.

We had two nuclear powered guided missile frigates—one at \$130.5 million and the other at \$127.8 million.

For the benefit of my colleagues who do not know what a frigate is, Mr. Speaker, it is something like a light cruiser of the type used in World War I and World War II.

The conferees agreed on the first of these DLGN's and also agreed on \$20 million for long leadtime items for the second DLGN.

So we got what was in our opinion a very good compromise.

There has been a lot of discussion and a lot of misinformation circulating about the language in the bill which would insure the building of the DLGN. We arrived at an agreement with the Senate that is wholly satisfactory to the House conferees since it carries out the basic concept of indicating to the executive branch that we mean what we say about building a nuclear surface Navy. The language we agreed on is this:

The contract for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized under Public Law 89-37, and for which funds are authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1967, shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest.



Public Law 89-521
89th Congress, H. R. 14888
July 27, 1966

An Act

80 STAT. 330

To amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by striking out in the first sentence "or rinderpest", and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "rinderpest, or screw-worm".

Screw-worms.
Eradication in
Mexico.
21 USC 114b.

SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals."

Approved July 27, 1966.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 1555 (Comm. on Agriculture).

SENATE REPORT No. 1342 accompanying S. 3325 (Comm. on Agriculture & Forestry).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 112 (1966):

June 6: Considered and passed House.

June 29: Considered and passed Senate, amended, in lieu of S. 3325.

July 12: House concurred in Senate amendment.

